CONCERNING

IMAGES

AND

IDOLATRY.

Abraham Woolhead

OXFORD,
Printed in the Year, 1689.

OXFORD,

Printed in the Year, 1689.

THE CONTENTS.

I. WHAT *Image-Worship granted by Catholicks Idolatrous.*

II. *That all former Idolatries about Images are contained therein.*

III. *The Roman Doctrine and Practice free therefrom.*

IV. *What Image-Worship allowed by the Roman Church.*

V. *The Roman Church not chargeable with the Abuses in her Worship.*

Conceded, That it is Idolatrous;

I. 1. *To Worship an Image made to represent a false God, tho such God imagined to be spiritual; immaterial; not to resemble, animate, inhabit, or give virtue to such Image.* §. 2.

2. *To make an Image of the true God, and to worship him in, by, or before it, as it truly representing his form or shape.* §. 3.

3. *To give Divine Worship, wholly or in part, to any Image, made to represent either the likeness, or any apparition of God (or to an Image of our Lord Christ), as to the mediate or immediate object of Divine Worship.* §. 4.

4. *To give any note of Honour, appropriated to God, to an Image, tho intending no Divine Honour thereto, where no invincible ignorance.* §. 5.

5. *To make an Image, not of God, but of an Angel or Cherub, or other Figure; and to worship God before it as a Symbol of his presence; or as believing God particularly present to, with, or in, it; or God to give virtue to it, or to others by it (this grounded on no Divine Promise) is a sort of Idolatry more or less ex-*

 cusable,

ouſable, as the error of the judgment more or leſs voluntary. §. 6.

II. 1. *The Heathen, by their Images, worſhiped not the one true, but many, and falſe Gods or Demons; groſly erring in the Divine Attributes, and communicating Divine Honours to their inferior falſe Gods.* §. 7.
2. *The Jews, both at* Sinai *and* Bethel, *worſhiped not the God of* Iſrael, *but the Calves and molten Images.* §. 8, 9.

III. 1. *The making any Figure of God is matter of opinion only, and by ſome denied to be lawfully done. Univerſally denied that any ſuch Image may be made (in the ſame manner as thoſe of a Creature, or our Lord) to infer any form or ſhape proper to God: Tho accounted lawful to repreſent any viſible apparition of any Perſon of the Trinity.* §. 12.
2. *In neither the Metaphorical Repreſentations of the Trinity, nor thoſe of our Lord, or his Saints, any particular preſence of the Trinity, our Lord, or his Saints, affirmed by Catholicks. No Virtue in ſuch Image for which to worſhip, honour, or confide therein: Or to Honour or Worſhip our Lord thereby: Or our Requeſts rendred more prevalent with its Exemplar or Prototype thro, or by, It. Or the Exemplar by, or thro it rendred more exorable to his Suppliants.* §. 13. (*The Benediction of them not deriving virtue to them, but imploring God's bleſſing on the uſers of them.* §. 14.)
3. *No Prayer tho made before, directed to, an Image; believed neither to be indued with life, or inhabited by the Deity: Neither ſacrificed to, nor honoured with any ſigns of a Sovereign Adoration.* §. 15.
4. *No Cult proper to the Exemplar (in the relative veneration, for the Perſons ſake repreſented thereby) given to Images; either* Latria *to thoſe of our Lord, and the Bleſſed Trinity; Or* Dulia *to thoſe of the Saints.* §. 16.

Shewn

Shewn by the Councils, of Nice 2. *and* Trent, *and other preceding Councils*; *St.* Gregory. §. 20, 21, 22.

Concerning the Council of Franckfort, *the* Caroline *Books, and the Reasons exhibited therein against Images.* §. 25, 26, *&c.*

No Honours from Lights, Odours &c. *applied to Images, Reliques, Saints, amount to* Latria. §. 30. 31, 32.

To which Council, the Nicene, *or* Franckfort, *Obedience due.* §. 35. &c.

Concerning the Schoolmens Opinion herein. §. 37. &c.

5. *No external signs of Honour, appropriated to God, exhibited to Images: No Sacrifice as in the Heathen and Jewish Idolatry.* §. 38.
6. *Protestants granting the Roman Church a true Church, consequently free her Worship of Images from Idolatry.* §. 41.

IV.

1. *Catholicks maintain the use of Images many ways beneficial; to fix, or heighten, Devotion; excite Affections; revive the Memory; invite our Addresses and application to their Exemplars.* §. 42.
2. *Maintain also a Veneration properly due to Images in themselves as the proper Object of such Honour.* §. 43.
3. *But this only Relative, not* propter se: *but for the Exemplar's sake.* §. 43.
4. *Maintain the making, using, or worshiping, so as is here asserted, of Images not to be prohibited in the Decalogue.*

1. *Because otherwise the prohibition of making or having an Image, in any sense whatever, would thus be inferred from the Text.*
2. *Because else such Worship must be extended to all Creatures. But it seems unreasonable to hold, either all Worship whatever to a Creature for-*

forbidden by the Decalogue: Or, that, tho forbidding only Latria, *yet it forbids any Worſhip at all to Images. Suppoſing all Worſhip of Images prohibited by the Decalogue, yet if Images be worſhiped by an inferiour Worſhip lawfully given to other things, it may be a Sin, but no Idolatry.* §. 45.

Some Divines denying any Worſhip whatever to Images; deny alſo the making and uſing thereof; and reſtrain this Precept as Temporal to the Jews; Grant alſo the Jews not prohibited hereby the Adoration of other Sacred things, hence inferring the prohibition of Image-Worſhip, having in it nothing of Morality; ſo that this Opinion is utterly unſerviceable to Proteſtants who are preſſed by many difficulties: The Cherubim; Brazen Serpent; Solomon's *framing ſeveral Figures as without, ſo without breaking, any Command.* §. 46.

5. *But this Worſhip or Reſpect of an Image not the ſame as to the Prototype, or implying our ſubmiſſion to it; or its excellency above us; but relative, inferior, and ſuch as is given to other appurtinents of holy perſons, and the inſtruments of Religion: all theſe being by the* Councils *and the* Schoolmen *compar'd and equall'd as defending Image-Worſhip.* §. 47.

6. *Veneration due to Holy things granted by Proteſtants.* §. 48.

7. *The Honours externally imparted to Images are, baring the head, bowing, kiſſing, embracing, lights, perfumes* &c: *internally, an eſteem of them for their relation to ſome nobler Object than our ſelves; and an intention by our outward geſtures to declare to perſons of underſtanding, the Exemplar or others, the value we ſet on any thing ſo nearly relating to ſuch holy Perſon.* §. 49.

8. *Not neceſſary that this eſteem or reverent treatment of inanimate things (for the ſake of ſome ſacred perſon*

ſon they appertain to) *ſhould therefore be the ſame of all things relating to ſuch perſon.* §. 50.

9. *The lawfulneſs of an inferior Veneration of Images being cleared, no need to inquire whether the preſent practice herein be ancient, and the modern uſe preciſely the ſame as of former ages. For what at any time is lawfully practiſed may at any time lawfully begin to be ſo. And Antiquity in not condemning, juſtifies the preſent Practice. Scripture-example without a Precept is ſufficient. The non-practice argues not the Tradition not Apoſtolical.* §. 53.

Proteſtants grant Images began to be uſed in the Fourth Age.

V. *The Church not chargeable with the Abuſes about Images; She regulating by her Biſhops both the making and uſe of them. Nor bound in favour to Proteſtants to quit all her Images; as neither do Proteſtants theirs in favour to Puritans.* §. 58.

The Church not chargeable with Idolatry for ſome particular Practices therein; becauſe the internal act of Worſhip not knowable by others. §. 59.

The external ſuch as is practiſed among Catholicks (*abſtracting from a bad intention*) *may be lawfully uſed in the honour given to a Creature.* §. 60.

The great guilt and the many inconveniencies preſſing thoſe that charge the Church with Idolatry in the matter of Images. §. 61.

UMI

CONCERNING

IMAGES

AND

IDOLATRY.

§. 1. IN this Diſcourſe concerning the Worſhip or Veneration of Images I ſhall proceed by theſe ſteps. 1. I ſhall ſhew what Worſhips of Images are willingly granted by Catholicks to be Idolatrous. 2. That all the former Idolatries in this kind, Heathen, Jewiſh, or any other, are comprehended in ſome of them. 3. That from any ſuch Idolatry the Roman Doctrine and Practice, in their Veneration of Images, is clearly free. 4. What Worſhip or Veneration of Images the Roman Church allows, and contends for. 5. That this Church is no way chargeable with the Abuſes happening in ſuch Worſhip.

I. §. 2. I. Firſt, then, Concerning Idolatrous Worſhips of Images theſe things are willingly granted.

1. That to Worſhip, or Bow to, an Image made to repreſent a falſe God; tho ſuch God imagined to be Spiritual, or Immaterial; and tho imagined not to reſemble, not to animate, or inhabit, or have any preſence in, or to give any virtue to, ſuch Image, (altho ſuch a refined, and abſtractive Heathen-worſhip can hardly be produced), is Idolatry: Becauſe indeed the thing repreſented, and which they worſhip by, in, or before, this Image is not God, but an Idol, a Figment; either *Quod non eſt*, Nothing; or, *Quale non eſt*, no ſuch Thing as they imagine it.

§. 3. 2. Granted alſo; That making an Image or Repreſentation of the true God, (tho He confeſſed to be ſuch as he is in all his other Attributes), and worſhiping Him by, in, or before, it, if he be imagined to have any ſuch particular form, or ſhape, as the Image repreſents [as the Anthropomorphites conceiv'd him to bear an humane ſhape; and moſt of the Heathen erred, as in other of God's Attributes, ſo in this, the not believing the pure *Spirituality*, and *Infinity* of his *Eſſence*, *Act.* 17. 29, 30. (as in the laſt of theſe do at this day the Socinians), and ſo were prone to make ſeveral Similitudes and Figures,] is alſo Idolatry; that is, a worſhiping him as ſomething He is not, or as having ſome ſhape, figure, or members, he hath not. And is expreſly forbidden by God in the Second Commandment (according to the Proteſtant-account) *Exod.* 20. 4. *Thou ſhalt not make unto thee any graven thing, or any likeneſs that is in Heaven* &c. *thou ſhalt not bow down unto them, nor ſerve them.* Where, by *ſerve them* is underſtood, 1 either giving Divine Honor to any of them, and ſerving them as God, *ſtrange God's* being prohibited juſt before, *verſ.* 3. and, *I am a jealous God*, following preſently after, *ver.* 5.; 2 Or giving Honor to God by any ſuch Image, as a Similitude of God; or giving to ſuch Image any inferior honor whatever, as to the Similitude of God; or as having any *virtue* in it, whereby to render our Devotions more acceptable to God. Of which *Moſes* ſpeaketh, *Deut.* 4. 15, 16, 17. *Take good heed to your ſelves* &c. *for ye ſaw no manner of Similitude in* Horeb. See alſo *Iſa.* 40. 18. 46. 5. *Act.* 17. 29. Thus, therefore, we are forbidden, to give God any honor by any kind of Image or Figure ſo deſigned: and, as not to make the Image of any other God, ſo neither of the true with conceiting it to have any likeneſs of him, or him to have any preſence in it, or to communicate any Divine Virtue thereto, whereby our ſervice may be rendred more acceptable to him through, or by, it. Nor was ſuch law obligatory only to the Jews, but is ſo to all men for ever.

Elius, Sent. 3. Diſt. 37. *Contra iſtam prohibitionem* (*Decalogi*) *peccatur tribus modis.* 1. *Si ipſum Simulachrum habetur pro Deo.* 2 *Si Creatura per Simulachrum repræſentata colitur ut Deus.* 3 *Si ita habetur Simulachrum* [tho in an intention of worſhiping the true

true God] *quaſi per illud Deitas ipſa effigiaretur.* Bell. de Imag. 2. l. 13. c. *Qui imaginatur Deum eſſe ipſi Idolo ſimilem, dum putant ſe colere Deum verum, revera non colunt niſi figmentum ſuum.* Conc. Trident. Seſſ. ult. *Si aliquando hiſtorias & narrationes ſacræ Scripturæ, cum id indoctæ plebi expediat, exprimi & figurari contigerit, doceatur populus, non propterea Divinitatem figurari, quaſi corporeis oculis conſpici, vel coloribus, aut figuris exprimi poſſit.*

3. It is granted alſo; That to give λατρεία or Divine Worſhip wholly, or in part, to any Image (made to repreſent, I ſay, not only the Likeneſs of God, but of any Apparition of God, or to any Image of our Lord Chriſt) as to a mediate, or immediate, Object of ſuch Divine Worſhip, is flat Idolatry: Since ſuch perſon muſt either hold ſuch Image to be God, or ſuch ſupreme Worſhip lawful to be given to what is not God. §. 4.

Of which thus *Bellarm.* De Imag. 2. l. 24. c. *Non licet Imagines colere Divinis honoribus,* i. e. *cultu Latriæ, etiamſi quis dicat, id ſe facere propter Deum vel Chriſtum, non propter imagines; nam hoc ipſo quod eas colit divinis honoribus convincitur eas colere propter ipſas, non propter Deum quicquid ipſe verbis dicat* [for none can give an interior ſupreme Honor to what really he holds not Supreme.] And, —*Quis diceret, ſe exhibere Latriam Imaginibus, quæ eſt divina Servitus in affectu ſolo conſiſtens, concederet eo ipſo, ſe Imaginibus tanquam Diis ſervire,* ſaith *Vaſquez,* In 3. *Thom. Diſp.* 109. *c.* 3. As for the Expreſſions of ſome Schoolmen how they are to be underſtood ſee below, §. 37. And hence alſo is conceded, That to profeſs the giving any Adoration, or Religious Worſhip, as *Adoration,* and *Religion* are taken ſtrictly and properly to ſignify *Divine* Worſhip, to any image of God, of our Lord, or his Saints, is Idolatry.

4. Granted; That to give any external Sign, Ceremony, or Note of Honor that is appropriated by God to himſelf, to any Image whatever, tho without any intention to give any divine honor to ſuch Image, where the ignorance is not invincible, is Idolatry: for this is worſhiping the Creature with a Worſhip due only to God. And ſuch Idolatry is it alſo, to communicate any Attribute or perfection of God, and conſequently §. 5.

quently the honor and reverence due to it, to any Creature.

§. 6. 5. Laſtly, Granted, (taking Idolatry in a larger ſenſe, ſo as groſs and ſuperſtitious Worſhips in a falſe and prohibited manner, tho of the true God, may be ſtiled ſuch, or at leaſt, are ſins highly offending God as being a ſervice unlawful and prohibited by him), That to make the Image (not of God, but) of an Angel, or Cherub, or any other Figure; and to worſhip God before it, as a Symbol of his Preſence; or as believing God there to have a peculiar Preſence to, with, or in, it; or God to give ſome virtue to it, or to others by it, when ſuch belief is a groundleſs figment of the Worſhipers, without any Divine Promiſe of any ſuch peculiar Preſence, or Virtue; this alſo will be a ſpecies of Idolatry, tho not ſo groſs or ſtupid as ſeveral of the former, and more or leſs excuſable according to the voluntary or involuntary ignorance or error of the Judgment from which it proceeds. And ſo, if we ſuppoſe here the beſt, that is pretended, or can be imagined of the Iſraelites worſhip of the Calf at *Sinai*, and afterward of thoſe at *Bethel*; *viz.* That all things were framed like to thoſe in the *Sanctum Sanctorum* of the Tabernacle, and afterward of the Temple; and then, the God of *Iſrael* only worſhiped as preſent here between the Cherubs; worſhiped in the ſame manner here, as in the Sanctuary, or Temple (tho there ſeems to be no truth in this ſuppoſition, that the Jews Worſhip was ſuch, ſee §. 8, 9.) yet, as the one was a true and acceptable worſhip of God, ſo would the other have been Idolatry, and the worſhip of their own groundleſs and irrational Figment, inſtead of the ſervice required from them by God; and where the error of their Judgment, being void of any Divine Promiſe, or Revelation concerning ſuch peculiar Preſence, was unexcuſable, as alſo was that of *Gideon*, *Jud.* 8. 27. who made an *Ephod*, and probably all other furniture belonging to the Divine Service, and ſet it up in his own City, tho without intention of introducing any ſtrange God, or Worſhip, See *ver.* 23, and 33. the people returning to ſtrange Gods (as before in *Jud.* 2. 11. 3. 7.) after his death, yet it is ſaid here, that all *Iſrael* fornicated, that is, committed Idolatry with his *Ephod*; and, that it was the ruine of his houſe.

Of

Of which thus St. *Auſtine*, *Q. Vet. Teſtam.* 7. *l* 41. *q.* moves this Queſtion. *Non fruſtra quæritur, cum Idolum non fuerit, id eſt, cujuſquam Dei falſi & alieni ſimulachrum, ſed Ephud, id eſt, unum de Sacramentis Tabernaculi quod ad veſtem Sacerdotalem pertineret, quomodo fornicationem Scriptura dicat populi iſta ſectantis, atque venerantis.* To which he anſwers, *Ideo ſcilicet quod præter Tabernaculum Dei, ubi erant iſta quæ ibi fieri juſſerat Deus* Iſrael, *extra ſimile aliquid fieri fas non erat.* And afterward, *Ut hoc ſit peccatum* Gedeon, *quod extra Dei Tabernaculum fecerit aliquid ſimile ubi coleretur Deus.*

Not much different ſeems alſo that of *Micah*, *Jud.* 17. 6. 13. and the *Manicheans* worſhiping the Sun for Chriſt; or Chriſt in the Sun. This of ſeveral ſorts and ways of Idolatry in Images freely granted.

II. Next, All the Idolatrous uſe of Images either by the Heathens, or Jews, or any others, ſeems to have fallen under ſome of theſe. II. §. 7.

1. For that of the Heathen, I think the matter out of diſpute; who whatever reſpect they gave to, or conceit they had of, the Images, it is certain, that the Gods or Demons inviſible, that theſe worſhiped by, or in, them, were not the one, true, but many, and falſe, Gods; whilſt they alſo groſly and ſtupidly (even the wiſeſt of them) erred both in ſeveral of the Divine Attributes, and communicated alſo to the inferior falſe Gods thoſe Attributes and Honors (as Sacrifice, for one) which do belong only to the Supreme. Neither can there be ſhewn (tho ſome Proteſtants take great pains for paralelling Heathens and Catholicks in Idolatry, to make the one in their Worſhip very acute and ſubtile, the other extremely ſtupid and ſimple, as if Chriſtianity much blinded the one, and Heatheniſme much elevated the other) I ſay, neither can there be ſhewn out of the Apologies of the Wiſeſt of the Heathen, (after Chriſtianity had ſubtilized them,) either in their own Works, or thoſe of the Fathers, any Heathen Image-Worſhip ſo refined and purified, as not to have been peccant in ſome of the circumſtances forementioned; *viz.* either imagining ſome things falſe concerning the Image,

or

or concerning the Deity they worſhiped, or both. Or, if there can, it ſhall be granted, that ſuch Perſon was no Idolater; but then, maintained alſo, that he was no Heathen.

§. 8. 2. For the Idolatry of the Jews, whether at *Sinai*, or at *Bethel* (both which ſome alſo labour much to extenuate, ſo to raiſe the Chriſtian's practice in their Veneration of Images &c. to equal it) yet we find the Scriptures moſt expreſs in charging them with worſhiping not the God of *Iſrael*, whom they are ſaid meanwhile to have forgotten and caſt behind them, but the Calves, the molten Images with Divine Honors, and Sacrifices. See, for the firſt, that of *Sinai*, the Declaration, of God, *Exod.* 32. 8. *They have made a molten Calf, and have worſhiped it, and ſacrificed to it, and have ſaid theſe* [or this *Nehem.* 9. 18.] *is thy God*, &c. And of *Moſes*, ver. 31. *They have made them a God of Gold.* And of the Pſalmiſt, *Pſal.* 105. 19, 20, 21. *They worſhiped the Golden Image, and changed their Glory* [their God, *Jer.* 2. 11.] *into the ſimilitude of an Ox, that eateth graſs*: and, *they forgat God their Saviour, which had done great things in* Egypt. And of St. *Stephen*, *Act.* 7. 41. *They made a Calf and offered Sacrifice to the Idol.* See for the ſecond, that of *Jeroboam*, 1. *King.* 12. 28. 32. where, after the like Proclamation, he is ſaid *to have ſacrificed to the Calves that he had made, and alſo to Devils*, 2. *Chron.* 11. 15. and is accuſed by the Prophet *Ahijah*, 1. *King.* 14. 9. *to have gone and made him other Gods, and molten Images, and to have caſt the Lord behind his back* [that is, forgot him, which ſeems not done in his worſhiping none, but him, between the Cherubim, and only miſtaking the right place.] But yet further, ſince we live in a world now not ſo addicted to Idolatry, as the old was, and ſo leſs crediting it; that we may the eaſilier imagine this Idolatry of the Jews ſo groſs, as here deſcribed, Conſider, how formerly in *Egypt* many of the Iſraelites themſelves went after, and ſerved, the Idols thereof. Of which God complains alſo, *Ezek.* 20. 7, 8. And alſo how in the Wilderneſs after this, at *Sinai*, and after the Tabernacle already erected, and God's Worſhip better ſetled, they ſtill entertained, and ſerved, there alſo, ſtrange Gods, *Moloch* and *Remphan*, and the Moabites Idol, *Baal-Peor*; and the

Hoſt

Hoſt of Heaven; had their Images, Figures, and Tabernacles; and, in effect, worſhiped the Devils, ſee *Levit.* 17. 7. that inſpirited them; ſee *Amos* 5. 25, 26. *Act.* 7. 43. *Ye took up the Tabernacle*, &c. And it is ſaid, *Ezek.* 20. 16. That, here, *their hearts went after their Idols, they and their Children*, *ver.* 24. And *Deut.* 32, 16, 17, 18. *That they ſacrificed to Devils, not to God; to new Gods, whom their Fathers feared not*; and that they *forgat God that formed them.* See *Lev.* 17. 7. *Num.* 25. 3. And, if you will look yet higher, ſee the infectious Idolatry of their Forefathers in *Ur* of the Chaldees, perhaps the cauſe of God's removing *Abraham* and his Family thence: *Joſ.* 24. 2. compared with *Gen.* 31. 53. *Iſa.* 43. 27. and *Gen.* 35. 2. Again; for *Jeroboam*'s Idolatry at *Dan* and *Bethel*, conſider his new coming out of *Egypt*, and what Idol-worſhips *Solomon* in his old age had done, or tolerated before him.

§. 2. Therefore Dr. *Hammond, Of Idolat.* §. 34, 35, 36. (having rejected *Moncæus* his Opinion) concludes, ---*The Queſtion which is ordinarily made* (*whether the Iſraelites worſhiped this Calf, or only God in this Calf*) *may well enough be ſuperſeded; and the Reſolution be ſufficiently clear, that they worſhiped not God only, but the Idol-Calf alſo.* And, ---*It is not improbable by the Text* (ſaith he, §. 34.) *that the Calf was by them thus counted of as an Image, which, upon* Aaron's *Conſecration, was thus animated by God* [as the Heathen alſo conceited of their Idols] *and ſo fit to go before them, and to be their Conducter in* Moſes's *abſence.* And of the ſame Opinion is Mr. *Thorndike*, perſwaded by the many Texts of Scripture clearly declaring it. See *Epilog.* 3. *l.* 25. *c.* where he ſaith, *p.* 297, of the Calf at *Sinai*: 'That he can by no means diſtinguiſh that 'act of the Iſraelites from the Idolatries of *Egypt*, which it 'was but late that they had forſaken. And, of the other at *Bethel*, 'That the appearance of the Idolatry of the Gentiles 'in the ſervice tendred to *Jeroboam*'s Calves is evident in 'Scripture, quoting 1. *King.* 14. 9. 15, 16. And, ---'That 'the Iſraelites attributed the incommunicable Name of God 'to thoſe imaginary Deities, which they advanced to the 'rank of the only true God. Thus Mr. *Thorndike*. All this I have

have produced to ſhew, that ſome Proteſtants have no juſt Grounds to plead ſuch diſcretion, and ſubtilty in the Iſraelites Idolatry.

§. 10. Yet thus much may be conceded, tho the uſe of them was very idolatrous; That, for the firſt making of theſe Calves, it is not improbable, that both the Calf in *Sinai*, and thoſe afterward ſet up in *Dan* and *Bethel*, were framed in reſemblance of the Cherubims ſet up in the Tabernacle firſt, and then in the Temple. The proper Face of a Cherub (as figured by *Moſes*, and afterward by *Solomon*, from which *Ezekiel*'s, as alſo St *John*'s ſomewhat differ) being that of a Calf; as appears from *Ezech.* 1. 10. compared with 10. 14 In which later the face of an Ox is called (contradiſtinct to the other three faces) the face of a Cherub: and ſee *Ezek.* 1. 7. for their feet. Now, tho the Tabernacle-Cherubims were ſet up after *Aaron*'s Calf, yet a pattern of theſe things was ſeen in the Mount before (See *Heb.* 8. 5. *Act.* 7. 44. *Exod.* 25. 9.); of which *Aaron* might have had ſome intimation, or alſo Viſion, together with the Seventy Elders in the Mount, *Exod.* 24. 9. 10.

§. 11. I ſaid, the face of a Calf, tho the Figure of their Body ſeems to be upright, as that of a Man. See *Exod.* 25. 18. where they are made at the two ends of the Propitiatory, and covering it not with their Bodies, but Wings ſtretched out from them: (unleſs any will have the Calf made erect and with hands): See *Ezek.* 1. 5. --41. 28, 29. compared with *Ezek.* 1. 10. And *Gen.* 3. 24. the Cherubin ſet with a flaming two-edged Sword. And it ſeems their form appeared not always exactly the ſame, but, according to the ſervice and uſe of them was diverſified, as they made his ſeat over the Propitiatory in the Tabernacle and Temple; where the face being ſaid to look toward the Propitiatory implies it was but one: Or as they drew or carried his Chariot in *Ezekiel*; where, to move always immediatly foreright without turning or wheeling about, they had four Faces: Or, as they attended on his Throne, praiſing, and worſhipping, in St. *John*'s *Rev.* 4. and the Prophet *Eſay*'s Viſion, *Iſa.* 6. where they had, becauſe of the Glory of the Divine Majeſty,

two

two wings to cover their face. Now, either *Aaron*'s and *Jeroboam*'s Molten-image was made exactly like these Cherubims, and the Scripture, in vilifying of them, calls them Calves; or else, by reason of the *Israelites* and also *Jeroboam*'s lately before coming out of *Egypt*, and being corrupted with its Idolatry, their Images varied in part from the true figures of the Cherubims, to bear the more resemblance to the God of *Egypt*, a Calf. This, for the occasion of making them. And lastly, If the worship of them made be only supposed of such a degree, to which some Protestants, much contrary to the Scripture-complaints, would abate it, yet thus also it is confessed before, §. 8. unexcusable: nor will such Concession prejudice any present Roman Practice in their behaviour toward Images. This, of the Heathen, and Jewish, Idolatries.

III. In the next place then I shall shew, That, from all these fore-mentioned Miscarriages the Christian's Practice, in the Veneration of Images, is easily acquitted. III. §. 12.

1. First, then, For any *Figure* of *God*, or of the *Divinity*; *1st*, It is no matter of Faith, but only of Opinion (some Catholicks denying it) that any such may be rightly made at all.

Bellarm. de Imag. 2. *l.* 8. *c.* *Non est tam certum in Ecclesia, an sint faciendæ Imagines Dei, sive Trinitatis, quam Christi, & Sanctorum. Hoc enim confitentur omnes Catholici, & pertinet ad fidem; illud est in opinione.*

2. Next, universally denied, That any Image, or Figure thereof may be made (in the same manner as those of Creatures, or those of our Lord Christ himself are) to signify any form or shape proper to it: and who shall worship God as having any such likeness is censured before. But as for the visible Apparitions of any Person of the Trinity which have bin made in Scripture, It is by many Catholicks conceived lawful to represent in a Picture to one man's eye, what hath bin seen by another's. As the sitting of the Ancient of Days in *Daniel*, *Dan.* 7. 9. or Descent of the Dove in St. *Matthew*, *Ch.* 3. 16. that is, to represent not the true figure of *God*, but

the true figure of his *Apparition*, and an Emblematical or Metaphorical Presence of God. The lawfulness of which is thus vindicated by Dr. *Hammond*, *Of Idolatry*, §. 58. 'Notwithstanding that the making any Image of God is prohibited: 'yet if in the representation of a sacred story there be set 'down any form, particularly an eye, a ray, a glory, *&c.* [I add, or such form, as the First or Third Person of the Trinity hath appeared in, a Man, *Ezek.* 1. 26. a Dove, *Jo.* 1. 32.] not 'to signify any supposed likeness of him (which is impossible) 'but only to present him to the mind of the beholder in the 'doing some action of his (which is in effect to do the very 'same thing in a table, which the word *Jehovah* or *God* would 'do in a Book) I conceive not what charge could be laid on 'it, at least what degree or spice of Idolatry, unless I must be 'thought to worship the Name of God, because I write or 'read it. Thus He. And to Mr. *Spencer*'s urging the lawfulness of representing God, as he hath pleased in the former Visions to represent himself, Dr. *Fern*, *Answ. to Spencer*, p. 57. answers, 'That the representations of these Visions are tolerable: And if of these Visions tolerable, why not also of some part of them? As the Ancient of Days sitting on a Throne, to represent his coming to Judgment; Or the figure of a Dove, to signify a peculiar presence and assistance of the Holy Ghost; where nothing untrue or unwarranted by Scripture is designed: the care and over-sight of which is committed to the Church Governors. And, these thus represented, why may not the same reverence be given to such figures recommended to us by such sacred Scripture-Apparitions, as is to other representations of sacred Persons, our Lord, or his Saints limned, or drawn in the like stories; and why may not those Persons of the Trinity be worshiped before such Symbolical Figures, or Representations of them, if our Lord Christ may before his? Of which more hereafter. Only provided, this difference always be put; that we imagine no true resemblance of the Person in the one, as we do in the other, and that our devotion reflect not on the similitude of the Person, but of the Apparition, and on the reality of some gracious operation thereof.

2 In none of these, whether Metaphorical Representations of the Trinity, or proper ones of our Lord or his Saints, do Catholicks affirm or pretend any peculiar presence of the Deity, of our Lord, or of his Saints; no Virtue, either natural, or accessory and derivative in any such Image, for which it should be worshiped, or honoured, or trusted in; or, for which, our Lord should be honoured, or worshiped by it; or our requests to have any more access or efficacy *by*, or *through*, any such Image, to, or upon, its Exemplar, or Person represented: Or, again, the Exemplar any greater influence, *by*, or *through* it, upon those, who supplicate him before it. Nor seemet the Expression of the Council of *Trent*, Sess. 25. [*Per Imagines quas osculamur, & coram quibus caput aperimus & procumbimus, Christum adoramus, cujus illæ similitudinem gerunt*] to have any other meaning than this, That *per osculationem imaginum*, and *apertionem capitis* &c. *coram illis, adoramus Prototypum:* that by, or in, that inferior reverence and respect we give to them, we testify the Honor or Adoration we bear to him, they represent to us: as appears also by the words of the Council immediately preceding. —*Non quod credatur* &c. *sed quoniam honos qui eis exhibetur* [*i. e.* that Cult given them, expresly declared inferior by the Council of *Nice*, to whose explication the Council of *Trent* referrs us] *refertur ad Prototypa, quæ illæ representant.* In which sense, it is noted by *Estius*, 3. *Sent. Dist.* 9. §. 3. that this Saying of St. *Basil*, and some others, *Quod Honor Imaginis transit in Prototypum*, is taken, both by the second Council of *Nice*, by Pope *Adrian*, *Resp. Carol. c.* 8. by *Damascen*, *De Fid. Orthod. 4. l.* 17. *c.* and also is understood to be taken so, and in such sense disputed against by the *Caroline* Books, *l.* 3. *c.* 16. and not in that other sense applied to it by some Schoolmen. As the Honor done to his Image, or to the Chair of State, redounds to the honor of the Prince, yet is not the same we give to the Prince. Thus then *per Imagines* we worship the Prototype; but not, as if by, or thro, these Images, as a more advantageous or acceptable *medium* of our service, we direct our proper worship to the Prototype, as some Protestants seem willing to mistake it. Or, if any will have the Council to speak here not of the inferior Adoration termi- §. 13.

nated in the Image, but of the ſupreme, given to the Prototype, then the Council in theſe words [*Per Imaginem Chriſtum adoramus*] muſt be underſtood to uſe *per* only to ſignify the motive, or occaſion, of our worſhip. As that Saying of St. *Gregory*, *Epiſt.* 7. *l.* 53. long ago expreſſeth it: *Et nos quidem ante Imaginem Salvatoris non quaſi ante Divinitatem proſternimur; ſed illum adoramus, quem per Imaginem aut natum, aut paſſum* &c, *recordamur.* But I ſay, tho Catholicks may thus make the Image, or rather our beholding it, a *medium* of exciting the Remembrance, and ſo the Love, Honor, Worſhip, of the Exemplar, yet they make it no *medium* of the foreſaid worſhip to the Exemplar or Prototype [*Non quod credatur* (ſaith the Council of *Trent*, Seſſ. 25.) *ineſſe aliqua in iis virtus, propter quam ſint colendæ: vel quod fiducia in iis ſit figenda.*] Laſtly, Catholicks pretend no advantage, in the uſe of ſuch Images, either to render our Prayers, or Worſhip, more acceptable to God, or his Saints, or more effectual to us, ſave ſo far as the frequent beholding ſuch Repreſentations may excite, and increaſe our devotion, affection, and love, and imitation of their Virtues *&c.* and this devotion, fection, imitation obtain a more gracious acceptance and reward.

§. 14. Neither have the ſolemn Benedictions of Images uſed in the Church any ſuch deſign, as to derive from above any ſpecial virtue into them, but only, as in all other benedictions of God's Creatures, to implore God's bleſſing on them for that purpoſe, to which they are made uſe of; *viz. Ut quoties illas Imagines ſive effigies oculis corporeis intuemur, toties eorum, in quorum memoriam & honorem adaptantur, Actus & ſanctitatem ad imitandum memoriæ oculis meditemur.* And, —*Ut quicunque coram illis* [imaginibus] *talem Sanctum honorare ſtuduerit, Illius precibus & obtentu a Deo gratiam in præſenti, & æternam gloriam obtineat in futuro.* Where the reward follows the devotion of the Supplicant, not any virtue of the Picture. And, if ſome Pictures or Images happen to be frequented with more Prayers (I mean, to the Perſon repreſented by them) more than others, becauſe ſome Miracles have bin done, as in ſome holy Places more than in ſome others,

others, ſo where ſome Holy Pictures or Images are, more than where ſome others; yet are ſuch Miracles no more affirmed to be done by any virtue of ſuch Images (which is by the Church declared to be none at all in *any*, *Non quod credatur ineſſe aliqua in iis virtus*) than by the virtue of ſuch Holy Place; But only from God's good pleaſure; a reaſon of which, as to the places, and times, and other circumſtances he chuſeth, we are not to enquire. Now, as no ſuch corrupt Imaginations concerning any Divine influence or virtue of Image, have ever bin in the Chriſtian Church, ſo have always ſome ſuch Imaginations attended all former Idolatrous worſhip of Images that have ever bin; Heathen, or Jewiſh. Unleſs it were an Idolatry, peccant only in the Exemplar; worſhiping that which is repreſented by the Image (ſuppoſe the deceaſed Emperor) for a God which is not ſo; and not at all faulty about the Image, if uſing it only as a Memorial of him. For, ſome Idolatry may be without, or beſide, and was before, any Images.

3*ly*, Neither doth the Roman Church admit any Prayer, §. 15.
tho at pleaſure ſaid *before*, to be directed *to*, any Image; (excluding here the Proſopopeias ſometimes found in the Church's Poetry (as, *O Crux, ave ſpes unica:* for, *Crucifixe*) and by the learned, who uſe them, ſufficiently underſtood in a Catholick ſenſe) they being held, as without life, or knowledge, ſo without any animation or inhabitation of the Deity [*non quod credatur ineſſe aliqua in iis Divinitas, —Vel quod ab eis ſit aliquid petendum*, ſaith the Council, *Seſſ.* 25. And *Bellarm. De Imag. 2. l.* 18. *c. Precaturi ad Imagines accedimus, non ut invocemus imaginem, ſed ut memoriam ejus, quem orare volumus, nobis imago refricet:* This indeed being the chiefly profeſſed Catholick uſe of them.] Neither do Catholicks offer any Sacrifice to them; a thing the Heathen profeſſed: or uſe any other external Ceremony of worſhip whatever, appropriated by God to himſelf.

4. All theſe Fancies concerning, and Practices toward Im- §. 16.
ages being rejected by the Church, Neither 4*ly* do Catholicks, in the relative Veneration which they retain of them, for the Perſon's ſake whom they repreſent, yet give the proper Cult

or

or Worſhip due to the Exemplar unto them: either *Latria* or Divine Worſhip to the Images of our Lord Chriſt, or to the Metaphorical and Hiſtorical ones of the Trinity; or that inferior called *Dulia* to thoſe of Saints. And therefore in their applying either the term of *Adoration*, or of *Religious* Worſhip to Images or any other ſacred thing or perſon, ſave to God only, they declare their not taking or uſing theſe words in the moſt ſevere, ſtrict, or proper ſenſe; for ſo they grant them to be uſed to ſignify only the ſupreme worſhip due to the Divine Majeſty.

Of which thus St. *Thomas*, 22ª, q. 81. art. 5. *Religio eſt, quæ Deo debitum cultum offert.* And *Art.* 1. *Religio eſt virtus, per quam homines Deo debitum cultum & reverentiam exhibent.* And *Religio* (ſaith he) *habet duplices actus: quoſdam quidem proprios & immediatos, quos elicit, per quos homo ordinatur ad ſolum Deum; ſicut ſacrificare, & adorare, & alia hujuſmodi.* Here we ſee both *Religio* and *Adoratio* appropriated to God. *Vaſquez* in 3. Part. *D. Thom.* Tom. 1. Diſp. 98. c. 1. *Vera ſententia, Duliam qua Sanctis cultum exhibemus, peculiarem eſſe virtutem a Latria, aut Religione, diſtinctam --- atque adeo Religionem circa cultum ſolius Dei verſari.* And, *---Cum Religio circa cultum Dei ſolum verſetur, cultus & honor, qui proxime Sanctis defertur, ad ipſam non poterit referri; alioquin ſi eſſet actus Religionis, Latriæ quoque diceretur. Latria enim & Religio idem ſunt.* Bellarm. De Sanct. Beat. 1. *l.* 12. *c. Aliquando accipiebant Patres nomen Religionis* [ſtrictius] *ut convenit virtuti illi ſpeciali quæ habet pro objecto cultum Dei, & quæ diſtinguitur ſpecie ab ea virtute qua colimus Sanctos: aliquando largius, pro omni illa virtute qua colimus vel Deum, vel Dei amicos, aliaſque res ſacras, & quæ diſtinguitur a cultu politico.* Franciſcus a Sancta Clara. *Prob.* 37. De Invoc. Sanct. *p.* 348. *Objectum* [actus] *Religionis eſt Deus ſolus. Cultus quo veneramur Sanctos non eſt religionis actus; nec eſt actus civilis; quia objectum non eſt aliquid civile, ſed ſupernaturale,* ſcil. *Sanctitas eorum.*

§. 17. Therefore it may be obſerved of the two Councils that have chiefly ſpoken of Image-worſhip, the ſecond of *Nice*, and that of *Trent*. 1. That the Council of *Trent* in the Decree *De Reliquiis Sanctorum & ſacris Imaginibus*, Seſſ. 25. purpoſely

posely forbears to use either of these expressions *Adoration*, or *Religious Worship*. *Sanctorum cum Christo viventium* (saith it) *sancta Corpora a fidelibus veneranda esse. Sanctorum reliquiis venerationem atque honorem deberi, & eas a fidelibus utiliter honorari. Imaginibus Christi & Deiparæ Virginis* &c. *debitum honorem & venerationem impertiendam. Et Christum adoramus, Sanctos veneramur.* A thing observed not only by *P. Veron* and others in defence of this Council, but by *Daille, De Religios. cult. objecto* 4. *l.* 1. *c.* with this uncharitable censure annexed, That they did it *out of cunning to conceal the true Doctrine of their Church.* I would he and other Protestants would make good use of this their not speaking their mind to submit to their moderate Decree, and they will be content he should forbear any subscription to their mental Reservations; or, if he will, to their Schoolmen's Speculations. His words are, *Hæc illi versute, ut solent. Primo enim, non* adorationem, *aut* cultum religiosum (*quæ verâ est ipsorum sententia*) *sed venerationem suis Reliquiis decernunt, superstitionis suæ dedecus hujus vocabuli ambiguitate obumbrantes.* But indeed such was the Councils prudence, to cut off occasion from them who seek occasion, and to deprive their adversaries of any advantage (whose stile therefore, we see, much displeaseth them) from such general and equivocal words (tho cautiously explained, when formerly used) of making plausible declamations to the vulgar against her innocent Doctrine. This for *Trent*.

2. Next, Observable also, that the second Council of *Nice* §. 18.
useth indeed the term of προσκύνησις, *Adoration*, but usually accompanied and qualified with some diminutive Epithet, and explained by *veneratio, osculum, amplexus; honorabilis salutatio, reverens accessio* &c. And in their Epistle to the Emperors *Act.* 7. sheweth the word *Adoration* to be equivocal; and, to shew a salutatory Worship as well as Latrical and Divine: That in the Scripture, as it is used to God in the Decalogue *Dominum Deum tuum adorabis*; so to Men also frequently, as *Abraham adoravit filios Heth: Jacob, Esau,* and *Pharaoh: David, Jonathan,* &c. That for the Fathers *Gregory Nazianzen* saith, *Serm. de Nativitate Christi*; *Bethlehem.cole &*

pre-

præsepe adora (The like we find in St. *Jerome*, *Apol. contra Ruffin.* 3. l. *Bethleem meam reversus sum*; *ubi adoravi præsepe & incunabula Salvatoris.*) On which, — *Quis* (saith they) *nisi insensatus existimet hæc* περὶ τῆς ἐν φάτνῃ λατρείας *pronunciari.* They urge the Church Hymn τὸν σταυρόν σου προσκυνοῦμεν Δέσποτα, *Crucem tuam adoramus Domine*; *Quod certissime* (say they) *salutatio est, & dicitur.* Thus they defend the word *Adoration* to be used to express a salutatory Honor.

For which we have *Chemnitius*, *Exam. Conc. Trid.* p. 4. p. 696. his Confession thus far. *Quidam* (saith he) *vocabula mitigare studuerunt, ut* Act. 3. Constantinus Cypri *Episcopus dicit.* ----*Suscipio venerandas Imagines: Adorationem autem, quæ fit secundum* λατρείαν, *tantummodo Supersubstantiali & Vivificæ Trinitati conservo. Et* Act. 7. *Dicunt veram latriam soli Divinæ Naturæ competere. Esse autem aliam honorariam adorationem: sicut* Jacob *adoravit* Esau. *Gen.* 33. Abraham *filios* Heth. *Gen.* 23. Jacob Pharaonem *Gen.* 47. &c. *Quando itaque dicitur, Imagines adorandas, non intelligi cultum Latriæ: Sed adorare idem valere, quod salutare, amplecti, & amare, sicut Pharisæi scribuntur amasse salutationes in foro,* Matt. 13. &c. *Volunt igitur quidam vocabulo Adorationis in Actis illius Synodi nihil aliud intelligi, quam exhibitionem honoris seu reverentiæ quæ fit externo aliquo gestu, vel inclinatione capitis, vel genuflectione, vel amplexu, osculo, & hujusmodi.* Thus he; rightly; if instead of *Quidam* he had put, *Omnes.* For, we see, it is the publick stating of the whole Council in *Act.* 7.

Lastly, whatever the word προσκύνησις or *Adoration* may properly signify, the same Fathers declare in their Decree, that the veneration, or reverence, or call it what we will, that is given by them to Images, neither for the inward intention, nor outward ceremony or signs of it, is any other, than that which is generally given even by the Iconoclasts to other sacred things, to the Cross, the holy Utensils, the Gospels, Relicks, Churches, and such as the Christians of those days gave also to the Emperors Statues. Now, the worship meanwhile they exhibit to Images certainly is not what their expression may seem to some most properly to signify, but what they explain themselves to mean by it; and, if such

ſuch worſhip lawful, their ſuppoſed a fault is only verbal. And here alſo the *Caroline* Books (obſerving this wariness in this Decree of *Nice*, as *Daille* and others in that of *Trent*) 3. *l.* 17. *c.* ſay, the Council did this to palliate and diſguiſe their Error to the common people: (of which more anon;) And 2ly, 3. *l.* 16. *c.* That tho the *learned* do avoid ſuch a miſtaken Adoration, yet the *unlearned* are ſcandalized thereby, and fall into it: which alſo now is the laſt Plea of Proteſtants againſt the Roman Church.

Well then: Theſe things are clear, that the word *Religious* §. 19.
is not uſed at all by either Council, and is by thoſe Roman Authors, which uſe it, explained to mean, not Divine, but only an inferior worſhip of Perſons, or Things Sacred or Holy, to contradiſtinguiſh it to that worſhip given to Perſons dignified in the State, or to ſome things relating to them meerly upon a Civil account. And ſo was it uſed by St. *Auſtine* long ago. —*Memorias Martyrum* (ſaith he, *Contr. Fauſtum* 20. *l.* 21. *c.*) *Populus Chriſtianus religioſa ſolemnitate celebrat.* And elſewhere, *De Civ. Dei, l.* 8. *c.* 27. *Quæcunque igitur adhibentur religioſorum obſequia in Martyrum locis*, &c. And *De Trinitate*, 3. *l.* 10. *c.* ſpeaking of ſacred things. *Honorem, tanquam religioſa*, (ſaith he) *poſſunt habere*; *ſtuporem, tanquam mira, non poſſunt.* And, as if he had foreſeen the preſent quarrel about it, and endeavoured to prevent it, he hath thus diſcourſed on the latitude of the uſe of this word, *De Civ. Dei* 10. *l.* 11. *c.* *Et ipſa religio quamvis diſtinctius non quemlibet, ſed Dei Cultum ſignificare videatur*; *unde iſto nomine interpretati ſunt noſtri eam quæ Græce* θρησκία *dicitur: tamen quia Latina loquendi conſuetudine non ſolum imperitorum, verum etiam doctiſſimorum, & cognationibus humanis atque affinitatibus & quibuſque neceſſitudinibus dicitur exhibenda religio* [and ſo much more *Sanctis*] *non eo vocabulo vitatur ambiguum, cum de cultu Deitatis vertitur Quæſtio: Ut fidenter dicere valeamus, Religionem non eſſe niſi Dei cultum: quoniam videtur hoc verbum a ſignificanda obſervantia propinquitatis humanæ inſolenter auferri. Quæ itaque* θρησκία *Græce, Latine autem Religio dicitur, ſed ea quæ nobis eſt erga Deum, hanc ei tantum Deo deberi dicimus, qui verus eſt Deus, facitque ſuos cultores Deos.* Thus St. *Auſtine*.

Clear alſo, that the word *Adoration*, by the Council that uſeth it, is declared to be applied to Images in no other ſenſe, than as it is by the Scriptures (notwithſtanding *Dominum Deum tuum adorabis*) to *men*, to *ſcabellum*, *montem ſanctum*, *Templum* &c. and by the whole Chriſtianity of that Age, to the Croſs and other Sacred things; an Antiphon in the publick Liturgy of the Church, on *Good-Fryday*, being *---Crucem tuam adoramus Domine*, See *Ordo Romanus*. And *Alcuinus*, *De Divinis Officiis*, who is thought to be the Pen-man of the *Caroline* Books, in his Comment on the Liturgy *Die Paraſceves* there uſeth the ſame word. *--Venit Pontifex & adorat ---deoſculatur Crucem.* And, *---Qui non poſſunt habere de ligno Domini ſalva fide adorant illam* [Crucem] *quam habent*; meaning hereby veneration of it.

I ſay then, after this, Why ſtay we ſtill in the entrance of the Controverſy, and make verbal quarrels? What means ſuch Language, as this, of Biſhop *Andrews*? *Reſpon. ad Apol.* p. 200. 202, 203. *In ſecundo præcepto Legis Adoratio non reſtringitur, abſoluta eſt. 2. Diſtinguit Cardinalis de Adoratione ea, & non ea, ubi Lex ipſa non diſtinguit. Relatvam ſanctitatem tribuit Imaginibus*, id eſt, *minimam. Quibus adorationem tamen vindicat*, id eſt, *cultum maximum.* [Is this, *Abraham adoravit filios Heth*, or, *adorate ſcabellum, cultus maximus*? Or muſt not Biſhop *Andrews* diſtinguiſh at leaſt in the former?] *Non adorabis omnem ſimilitudinem. Immo adorabis aliquam ſimilitudinem. An non ex diametro contraria*? No: if we diſtinguiſh concerning *Adorabis*. So a late Author, *Dr. Stillingfl. Rom. Idol. c. 1. p. 87.* 'God (ſaith he) challengeth all Re-'ligious Adoration to himſelf [What? In whatever ſenſe *Adoration* or *Religious* can poſſibly be taken? properly, or improperly?] Again, *p.* 89. 'The Synod [of *Nice*] ſaid, it 'intended to give no proper Divine Worſhip to Images. But 'that is not the Queſtion, what they ſay; but what the na-'ture of the thing doth imply. Whether that Religious Wor-'ſhip, they give to Images, is not part of the Adoration which *is only due to God.* The nature of the thing, that is, of the Worſhip that is expreſſed by their words: and what is that then? Not *Latria*, ſay they, but *honoraria & ſalutatoria Adoratio.* Such, and only ſuch, (for, if not, name what the *Nicene* gave

to

to Images, that the *Gallican* gave not to the Croſs?) as is given to the *Goſpels*, and *Holy Veſſels*. And is this ſuch an Adoration as is only due to God? Or is Pope *Adrian* hard ſet to ſhew it was not ſo? What means, I ſay, ſuch looſe and confuſed diſcourſe? 'If (ſaith another, Dr. *Hammond*, *Of Hereſy*, §. 9. *n.* 18.) the Council of *Nice* define not for Ado-'ration of Images, then it is not rejected by us [*define not for Adoration:* doth he mean Adoration here, as that Council declares they took it, for Veneration? And will Proteſtants allow this?] And, if it doth define for Adoration, then was it rejected by *Franckfurt*. But means he here *Adoration, ſicut Deificæ Trinitati*, which *Nice*, as well as *Franckfurt*, rejected? Or, taken for *Veneration*, which *Franckfurt* denies to Images indeed, but allows to all other holy things: *viz.* To the Image of the Croſs, tho not, of our Lord: and, will that Doctor, think we, granting the one, differ with us for the other? What mean Proteſtants, after the diſtinguiſhing and clear dealing of the Church, to ſpeak thus in the Clouds? When they name *Religious*, take heed of telling us what they mean by it; or of touching the Catholick's explication of their meaning of it? Do you underſtand by it, (ſay we) any inferior veneration or reverence given to ſuch things as are called ſacred, and uſed in our Religion and Service of God? You your ſelves allow it, and give it; ſee below, §. 51. and the *Gallican* Biſhops did ſo, as much as *Nice*. Do you mean ſupreme and divine Worſhip due only to God? Catholicks deny it to any Creature, as much as you. Why is here made in Proteſtant Writers ſuch a *Petitio principii* ſtill? Why are not the former Diſputes contracted, and this only diſcuſſed: Whether ſacred Images, or Images of ſacred Perſons, our Lord, his Holy Mother, and the Saints are without Idolatry capable of ſuch a veneration, as is, or at leaſt hath bin heretofore, given generally by Chriſtians to other holy things? Or, Whether the veneration alſo of ſome things not ſacred, if only done to them in ſuch a manner, as we honor or reverence things ſacred, amounts to Idolatry? Or, Whether he, who acknowledgeth ſuch adoration of Images, as was anciently of the Croſs, maintains Idolatry? Laſtly, Whether ſome κατάχρησις (ſuppoſed, not granted) in their expreſſion, as

to the word *Adoration*, or *Religious* (yet theſe terms not uſed in the Council of *Trent:* and only the one of them uſed, but this explained and qualified in the Council of *Nice*) can amount to Idolatry by their Doctrine?

§. 20. This ſaid from §. 16. of the Church's explication of her terms, to remove all jealouſies, and leave thoſe excuſeleſs, who from equivocal words would aſperſe her Tenents; Now I ſhall give a particular account of the proceeding of her Councils in ſtating this matter, eſpecially that of *Nice* (referred to by that of *Trent*; which made this Article concerning Images, and ſome others in ſome haſt, for concluding the Council before the death of the Pope, then dangerouſly ſick.) The Decree of that Council, *Act.* 7. runs thus: *Definimus venerandas* (ſaith that Council) *& Sacras Imagines dedicandas, & in Templis ſanctis Dei collocandas habendaſque; quo ſcilicet per hanc Imaginum pictarum inſpectionem, omnes, qui contemplantur, ad prototyporum memoriam, & recordationem, & deſiderium veniant: Illiſque ſalutationem, & honorariam adorationem exhibeant; non, ſecundum fidem noſtram, veram latriam, quæ ſolum Divinæ naturæ competit; ſed, quemadmodũ typo venerandæ & vivificantis Crucis, & ſanctis Evangeliis, & Reliquiis ſacris, oblationibus ſuffitorum & luminarium, reverenter accedimus* [where note, that this latter *Quemadmodum oblationibus ſuffitorum & luminarium reverenter accedimus typo* (or, what if they had ſaid *imagini*?) *venerandæ & vivificantis Crucis & Sanctis Evangeliis, & Reliquiis ſacris,* was the univerſal practice of the whole Church in thoſe days, whether Eaſtern, or Weſtern, Iconoclaſts, or Catholicks.] See the ſame Declaration, made by ſeveral members of this Council, occurring often in the 2*d*, 3*d*, 4*th*, and 6*th Acts* of it. In this laſt, the Iconoclaſts, then alſo, accuſing the Catholicks of exhibiting *Latriam* to their Images, *Epiphanius* in his Reply exclaims; *O inſanientem linguam --- quæ Chriſtianorum inculpatam fidem in ſimulachrorum arbitratur tranſlatam culturam. Nemo enim Chriſtianorum eorum, qui ſub cælo ſunt, imagini latriam exhibuit. Etenim hoc eſt Gentilium fabulamentum, Dæmonumque invocatio* [viz. to give *latriam* or Divine Worſhip to Images.] The ſame is reiterated by *Adrian* in his Anſwer to the *Capitulare* (*Act.* 4. *cap.* 56.) *Qualiter in eorum*

eorum explanaverunt definitione, demonſtrantes eis [imaginibus] *oſculum & honorabilem ſalutationem reddere, nequaquam ſecundum fidem noſtram veram culturam, quæ decet ſolum divinam naturam.* And the Epiſtle of the *Nicene* Council to the Biſhops hath theſe words; *Quare eas* [imagines] *honorabiliter adoramus, & ſalutamus; idem enim ſignificant hæc duo verba.* This of the clear reſolution and explication of that Council.

§. 21. If we look before this Council, into the times when firſt happened ſome Controverſy about Images; and examine the Tenet or Doctrine of St. *Gregory*, conſulted concerning it; and which both the *Nicene* Council and Pope *Adrian* on one ſide, and the *Caroline* Books, and the *Gallican* Biſhops on the other, profeſſed to correſpond and concur with, we do find him indeed denying adoration to Images; but adoration taken ſtrictly *ſicut Deo*; but yet allowing veneration to them, as to other Holy Things (as Pope *Adrian* alſo in his anſwer to the *Caroline* Books repreſents it to *Charles* the Great.) Thus He in his Epiſtle to *Serenus*, 9. *l.* 9. *Ep. Et quidem quia eas adorari vetuiſſes omnino laudavimus, fregiſſe vero reprehendimus:* where the Reaſon of non-adoration rendred by him ſhews him to mean it of Adoration ſtrictly ſo taken. *Quia* (ſaith he) *omne manu factum adorare non liceat, quoniam ſcriptum eſt; Dominum Deum tuum adorabis, & illi ſoli ſervies.* So alſo in his Epiſtle to *Secundinus*, *l.* 7. *Ep.* 53. ſending to him a Picture of our Lord, as *Secundinus* had requeſted of him, He adds. *Scio quidem, quod imaginem Salvatoris noſtri non ideo petis, ut quaſi Deum colas.* By theſe two *Dominum Deum tuum adorabis*, and *non quaſi Deum colas*, we ſee the Adoration he excepts againſt: But then in the ſame Epiſtle he acknowledgeth a proſtration before ſuch Image, as a thing lawful. *Et nos quidem non quaſi ante Divinitatem ante illam* [the forementioned Image of our Lord] *proſternimur Sed illum adoramus, quem per imaginem aut natum, aut paſſum recordamur.* On which Pope *Adrian* in his Anſwer to *Charles* his Books, *c.* 50. *Act.* 4. *Sic & Secundino docuit, non quaſi Deum colere, ſed ante eaſdem ſacras imagines ſe proſternens, non quaſi ante Divinitatem, ante ipſas proſterni.* And thus *Spalatenſis*, *De Repub.* 7. *l.* 12. *c. n.* 47. *Videtur* [Gregorius] *quidem fateri, ſe fideles ante imaginem ſolere*

solere prosternere, sed explicat in hac prostratione non imaginem, sed per imaginem exemplar adorari. Again in his Epistle to *Januarius*, *l.* 7. *Ep.* 5. when a zealous new Convert had carried the Image of our Blessed Lady and the Cross, and by force set them up in the Jews Synagogue of that place where he lived, St. *Gregory* reprehends the fact done without the Bishops Order; and requires *Januarius* the Bishop, That ---*sublata exinde cum ea qua dignum est veneratione Imagine atque cruce, debeat quod violenter ablatum est reformare* &c. Here is *Veneration*. But *Jonas Aurelianensis*, *In Lib. Sacrament.* quotes a Prayer of his, wherein he useth the word Adoration also taken in a larger sense to a thing made with hands, *viz.* The Cross. ---*Deus qui unigeniti tui Domini nostri Jesu Christi pretioso sanguine humanum genus redimere dignatus es, concede propitius, ut qui ad adorandum vivificam crucem adveniunt, a peccatorum suorum nexibus liberentur.* Thus St. *Gregory*; whose Doctrine both the *Caroline* Books, the Emperor *Charles*, and Pope *Adrian* appeal to. See *Adriani Respons.* cap. ult.

§. 22. Not long after St. *Gregory*, we find ---*venerabilium Imaginum Picturæ*, in the 82. Canon of the Council in *Trullo*. *Inter venerabilium imaginum picturas* Agnus &c. After this *A. D.* 726. a Council was held at *Rome* by Pope *Gregory* II. against the Iconoclasts, urged by Pope *Adrian* in his Answer to the *Caroline* Books, *c.* 12. *Act.* 4. which decreed not only the lawful use, but Adoration, of Images. Again, not long after the *Constantinopolitan* Council of the Iconoclasts held under *Constantinus Copronymus*, 754, another Council was assembled at *Rome* by Pope *Stephen IV. A. D.* 769. 20. years before that of *Nice*, to which Council, (as *Anastasius* relates it in the Life of *Stephen*) were sent at the Pope's Request by *Charles* the Great and his Brother, twelve *Gallican* Bishops, persons eminent for Learning. His words are, ---*Dirigentes ipsi* [Papæ] *Christianissimi Reges duodecim Episcopos ex eiisdem* Francorum *regionibus nimis Divinis Scripturis & Sanctorum Canonum ceremoniis doctos & probatissimos viros.* Now this Council approved the Decree made concerning Veneration of Images in the former Council held under *Gregory II.* See *Adrian*'s *Respons. Act.* 4. *c.* 12. And, as *Anastasius* relates in the

the life of *Stephen*, *ſubtilius multa perindagantes ſtatuerunt magno honoris affectu ab omnibus Chriſtianis ipſas ſacras venerari imagines, ſicuti ab omnibus prædeceſſoribus hujus Apoſtolicæ Sedis Pontificibus, & cunctis venerabilibus Patribus uſque hactenus de earum honore obſervatum, effectum, & cunctis, ad memoriam piæ compunctionis eſt traditum.* Thus that Council under *Stephen*. Some years before this Council, and not long after that held againſt Images under *Conſtantinus Copronymus*, and ſome 20 years before that of *Nice*, the Eaſtern Patriarchs *Coſmas* of *Alexandria*, and two *Theodorus*'s, one the Patriarch of *Antioch*, directed to *Paul I.* Biſhop of *Rome* a Synodical Epiſtle; *In qua* (ſaith *Adrian*, *Reſponſ. ad Lib. Carol.* Act. 3. c. 2.) *de ſacratiſſimis ſubtili narratione, qualiter una cum noſtra S. Catholica & Apoſtolica univerſali Romana Eccleſia ipſi —Orientales orthodoxi Epiſcopi & Chriſtianus populus ſentiunt, & in earundum Sanctarum Imaginum veneratione ſincero mentis affectu ferventes in fide exiſtunt, ſtuduerunt, intimandum.* And afterward, —*Si quis non adorat imaginem ſive figuram Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti, neque humanationem ejus confitetur* [becauſe ſome Iconoclaſts held *Deum ſecundum humanitatem non circumſcriptibilem eſſe*] *talem impium Anathematizamus.* He alſo adds, —*Quam ſynodicam in Latino interpretatam eloquio Prædeceſſor noſter quondam ſanctiſſimus Dominus* Stephanus *Papa in ſuo Concilio quod & ipſe pro ſacris imaginibus una cum diverſis Epiſcopis in partibus* Franciæ *ſeu* Italiæ *fecit, ſuſcipientes ac relegentes placuerunt* &c. Thus two Roman Councils, and in the later alſo the learned *Gallican* Biſhops, and alſo all the Eaſtern Patriarchs contended for, and decreed, *Veneration* of *Images* before that of *Nice*.

§. 23. This ſaid of the Decree of the ſecond Council of *Nice* which was held in *A. D.* 787. and what paſſed before it: about ſome three years after it, and four years before the Council of *Franckfort*, were written the *Caroline* Books, ſome think, See *Matt. Weſtmonaſt. A. D.* 793. by *Alcuinus* the Emperor's Tutor, againſt the *Nicene* Council, and Adoration of Images. I ſay three years after that of *Nice*, as appears in the Preface. *Geſta præterea eſt ferme ante triennium & altera Synodus* &c. But meanwhile the Author or Authors of theſe Books knew nothing

nothing of Pope *Adrian*'s Legates, preſent in it, or his or the Eaſtern Patriarchs conſent to its Acts, but *l.* 1. *c.* 6. cenſures it becauſe the Roman Church was not conſulted by the *Nicene* Council, nor had given her conſent in this matter. *Quæ Eccleſia Romana* (ſaith the *Capitulare*, l. 1. c. 6.) *nullis ſynodicis conſtitutis cæteris eccleſiis prælata eſt, ſed ipſius Dei authoritate primatum tenet dicentis*; *Tu es Petrus* &c. *Tibi dabo claves* &c. And afterward, ---*Quod regulariter omnes Catholicæ debent obſervare Eccleſiæ, ut ab ea poſt Chriſtum ad muniendam fidem adjutorium petant, quæ non habens maculam nec rugam portentuoſa hæreſum capita calcat, & fidelium mentes in fide corroborat.* And concluding that Chapter thus, *Ipſo* [*i. e.* Petro] *interveniente, cujus Cathedræ ſumus ſequaces, regni cælorum, cujus ille Claviger factus eſt, mereamur eſſe compotes.* Therefore theſe Books were ſent by *Charles* to Pope *Adrian* to conſult his judgment, who alſo ſent to the Emperor *Charles* his Anſwer to them, in defence of that Council, probably before the ſitting of the Council of *Franckfort*; the Act of which Council, if condemning Adoration of Images, likely, he would not have paſſed over in ſilence, had he written after it.

§. 24. *An. Dom.* 794. and four years after the writing of theſe Books was the Council of *Franckfort* convened, and that *Apoſtolica authoritate* as it ſaith, for ſuppreſſing a new Hereſy inclined to Neſtorianiſme of *Felix* and *Elipandus*, and for ſetling the diſturbances made by it in *Spain*. In this Council, after the condemnation of the Hereſy of *Felix* and *Elipandus*, is ſaid to be paſſed this Decree againſt the *Nicene* Council concerning Adoration of Images, firſt publiſhed by a Proteſtant; ſince, out of a very ancient Copy, as he ſaith, and perhaps the ſame wherein the Proteſtant found it, by *Sirmondus*. 2. *Allata eſt in medium Quæſtio de nova Græcorum Synodo, quam de adorandis imaginibus* Conſtantinopoli [put for *Niceæ*] *fecerunt, in qua ſcriptum habebatur, ut qui imagines Sanctorum ita ut Deificam Trinitatem ſervitio aut adoratione non impenderent, anathemata judicarentur. Qui ſupra, Sanctiſſimi Patres noſtri omnimodis & orationem & ſervitutem eis renuentes contempſerunt, atque conſentientes condemnaverunt.* Much diſpute hath been, and many reaſons on either ſide produced, concerning the

the true Decree of this Council, whether it was for, or against Adoration, *i.e.* Veneration of Images: Hiſtorians varying in this matter, and the former publiſhed Acts of this Council containing nothing thereof. But for the preſent we will ſuppoſe this forementioned Decree genuine; *i.e.* grant all, our Adverſaries can deſire, and proceed only to examine, how the *Nicene* Decree is any way debilitated thereby: Deſiring this on the other ſide to be granted me, that Pope *Adrian*, at leaſt, confirmed no ſuch Decree of *Franckfort*, upon theſe conſiderations: 1. Both becauſe *Adrian* profeſſed to the Emperor his admitting and confirming the Decree of *Nice*. 2. And alſo writ an Anſwer in defence of it to the *Caroline* Books; and particularly *Act.* 3. *c.* 9. to that Chapter (*l.* 3. *c.* 17.) which chargeth the *Nicene* Synod with the very ſame error as this *Franckfort* Decree doth; where he ſhews, that the *Nicene* Synod maintained juſt the contrary. And 3. becauſe in ſome parts of that Anſwer he produceth two forementioned Councils held at *Rome* (one of them by his immediate Predeceſſor *Stephen IV.* the delegated Biſhops of *France* alſo conſenting) to have decreed the ſame Veneration of Images before that of *Nice*; as alſo, his Predeceſſor St. *Gregory* to have taught it. And laſtly, 4. becauſe the *Gallican* Biſhops aſſembled at *Paris* under *Ludovicus Pius* in 824, when the former tranſactions of *Franckfort* could not be unknown or forgotten, accuſe Pope *Adrian* for ſiding with, and defending the Council of *Nice*, and Adoration of Images; not juſtly done, if his latter Act at *Franckfort* was contrary to, and condemned, both the Council of *Nice*, and conſequently his own Anſwer. Neither, tho *Ado* in his Chronicle, and ſo others after him, mentions the preſence of Pope *Adrian*'s Legates in this Synod of *Franckfort* (and they might be there, and diſſent) yet do I ſee any probability thereof; becauſe there is no mention made of them (as always uſeth to be) in the Acts of this Council; where there is, of all the other members of it; and of the preſence of the Emperor *Charles*: and it is alſo manifeſt, that Pope *Adrian*'s Epiſtle to the Spaniſh Clergy againſt *Elipandus*, inſerted in that Council, was procured by *Charles* his Agents at *Rome* before its ſitting.

§. 25. After this, to consider the Canon of *Franckfort* it self, we see it condemns those that give such Adoration to the Images of Saints as to the Deifical Trinity: which condemnation is such, as both the Council of *Nice*, and *Adrian*, and the present Roman Church do willingly admit and subscribe to; the Definition of *Nice*, as appears before, being point-blank opposite to any such Adoration; *Non secundum fidem nostram, veram latriam, quæ solum Divinæ naturæ competit; sed quemadmodum typo venerandæ Crucis, & Sanctis Evangeliis* &c. Only the application of such a Tenet, and such an Anathematisme, to the Council of *Nice* is that which it is most manifest the Fathers at *Franckfort* erred in; and the cause of such mistake seems to be, that the *Question*, indeed, about *Adoration*, and the *report* of such an Anathematisme by the *Nicene* Council [*in qua scriptum habebatur*, saith the *Franckfort* Decree] was *allata in medium*; but not the Copy it self; or, if the Copy, that Copy must be false: for in express words the true Copies have no such thing, but just the contrary. For we see, that the Copy of the Acts of this Council, tho it is granted, well known to the Author of the *Caroline* Books, and to the Assembly at *Paris* some twenty years after this at *Franckfort*, yet was not common in the West, or came into many hands; insomuch also as that it was unknown to St. *Thomas*, and the ancient Schoolmen. Hence that much cited Passage of *Hincmar* a Writer of those times, *Contra Hincmar. Laudun.* c. 20. [*Septima autem apud Græcos vocata universalis, Pseudo-Synodus, de Imaginibus quas quidam confingendas, quidam autem adorandas dicebant, neutra pars intellectu sano definiens, sive authoritate Apostolicæ Sedis non longe ante nostra tempora* Nicea *est a compluribus Episcopis habita, & Romam missa, quam etiam Papa Romanus in* Franciam *direxit, unde tempore* Caroli *Magni Imperatoris, jussione Apostolicæ Sedis, generalis Synodus in* Francia *convocante præfato Imperatore celebrata, & secundum Scripturarum tramitem, traditionemque majorum, ipsa Græcorum Pseudo-Synodus destructa est, & penitus abdicata, de cujus destructione non modicum volumen, quod in Palatio adolescentulus legi, ab eodem Imperatore Romam est per quosdam Episcopos missum.*] is found to have many mistakes in it: 1. who first mentions the *Constantinopolitan* and the *Nicene*

Nicene as one Council, divided into two extremes in their Opinion; 1. that it was held without the authority of the Roman Bishop, (which Error the *Caroline* Books had spread in the West, tho the Acts of the *Nicene* Council often make clear the contrary,) mention the presence of his Legates, and in *Actione* 2. recite Pope *Adrian*'s Synodical Epistle, sent by them, fully agreeing with the judgment of the Council concerning veneration of Images in such manner as other holy things. 3. That Pope *Adrian*, having received a Copy of it, sent it to *Charles*; and that, by the Pope's Order, a General Synod was called by the Emperor, in *France* he saith; but, surely, means this of *Franckfort*, wherein the Greek Pseudo-Synod was condemned; and that a large Book, written of the condemation of it (meaning the *Caroline* Books) was sent from *Charles* by some Bishops to the Pope: whereas such Books were written indeed, but long before the Synod of *Franckfort*; and so the Volume sent to *Adrian* not by some Bishops of the Council, but by *Engilbert* an Abbot a Favourite of *Charles*, and so answered by him probably before this Council; which was assembled indeed by the Apostolick Authority, but upon another occasion, the Heresy of *Elipandus*: Lastly, the *Nicene* Council maintaining Adoration of Images, but in a much more mitigated sense than *Hincmare*, and the *Gallican* Bishops, all deceived by the *Caroline* Books, apprehended it. The same mis-opinion of this Council of *Nice* also had *Jonas Aurelianensis*, who, writing against *Claudius Taurinensis*, an Iconoclast, yet declares himself also an enemy to the Adorers of Images. *Quod cum sciant* (saith he) *Imaginibus nil inesse Divini, majore invectione digni sunt, quod honorem debitum Divinitati impendant egeno & infirmo simulachro; atque idipsum nonnullis Orientalium, qui eodem sceleratissimo errori mancipantur, respondere solere.* In like manner seems the Synod of *Franckfort*, not having seen (nor perhaps the Emperor) (I know not by what miscarriage or concealment) the Acts of *Nice*, or *Adrian*'s Answer, to have bin deceived by the *Caroline* Books divulged some years before, and exhibited in that Synod.

And the particular mistake in the *Caroline* Books, which §. 26.

occaſioned the *Franckfort* Canon ſeems to be contained in the 3. *l.* 17. *c.* where the words of *Conſtantine* a *Cyprian* Biſhop in his Vote 2. *Counc. Nice. Act.* approving the Synodical Epiſtle of the Eaſtern Patriarchs runs thus: ---Ὁμόφρων γίνομαι ἀσπάζομαι καὶ ἀσπάζομαι τιμητικῶς τὰς ἁγίας καὶ σεπτὰς εἰκόνας: καὶ τὴν κατὰ λατρείαν προσκύνησιν μόνῃ τῇ ὑπερουσίῳ καὶ ζωαρχικῇ Τριάδι ἀναπέμπω. That is, *Concors efficior, ſuſcipiens & amplectens honorabiliter ſanctas & venerabiles Imagines. Atque Adorationem quæ ſecundum Latriam ſoli ſuperſubſtantiali & vivificæ Trinitati emitto. Et non ita ſentientes Anathemati ſubjicio.* But the *Caroline* Books give it thus: *Se ſuſcepturum & amplexurum honorabiliter Imagines, & ſervitium Adorationis* [or λατρείαν] *quod conſubſtantiali & vivificatrici Trinitati debetur, ei ſe redditurum.* Here miſtaking at leaſt in the ſenſe, *ei* for *eis*: (as afterward in the ſame Chapter where he recites it, it is not *ei*, but *illis*:) and referring it not to *Trinitati*, but *Imaginibus*: and then carried away with Paſſion the Author of the *Capitulare* forementioned ſaith, ---*Cæteris conſentientibus*, becauſe none of the other Biſhops cenſured this vote at all: Nor had they reaſon, as *Conſtantine* delivered it. And then, having thus made this paſſage his own, tho he read the Decree of the Council point-blank oppoſite. *Non veram Latriam, quæ ſolum Divinæ naturæ convenit* &c, and ſo the whole current of the Diſcourſe of that Council, yet it is clear to him that all that is but palliated ſtuff; and this one Biſhop ſpeaks the true Opinion of them all. His words in that Chapter are: ---*Errorem detegit* [this Biſhop] *infauſtum, quem illi videntur plebibus ingerere palliatum. Aiunt enim: Non adoramus imagines ut Deum, nec illis divini ſervitii cultum impendimus, ſed dum illas aſpicimus & adoramus, illo mentis noſtræ acumen dirigimus, ubi eos, quorum illæ ſunt, eſſe non ignoramus: at contra iſte illorum detegens errorem, & ſuam pandens abſque ulla obumbratione cogitationem, fatetur ſe quale Sanctæ Trinitati, tale illis exhibere ſervitium, talemque adorationem: ſicque abſurditatem quam illi introrſus retinent latenter, hanc iſte egerit patenter.* Thus he (whereas the higheſt word, this Biſhop ſpake, of the honor of Images, is ἀσπάζομαι τιμητικῶς) and ſo proceeds to the cenſure of his anathematizing the diſſenters. By all which it appears, this is the very place (moſt groſly miſtaken) on

on which the *Franckfort* Fathers grounded their Canon; condemning, as they had reaſon, ſuch an impious Anathema. And thus (by giving credit to the *Caroline* Books) one Biſhops vote miſtaken to ſay the contrary to what it doth, paſſeth for the true (but concealed and palliated) meaning of the whole Council; and its plain Declaration in the publick Decree, *Non veram Latriam*, afterward alſo often preſſed by Pope *Adrian*, is not admitted to be heard againſt it. This diſcovery is none of mine, but Dr. *Hammond*'s candid dealing in this matter; who ſaith it is a plain calumny to that Biſhop. He is ſeconded alſo herein by Mr. *Thorndike*, *Epilog. l.* 3. *p.* 363. 'It is to be granted (ſaith he) that, whoſoever 'it was who writ the Book againſt Images under the name of '*Charles the Great*, did underſtand the Council [of *Nice*] to 'enjoyn the worſhip of God to be given to the Image of our 'Lord (for of any other Image of God there was no queſtion 'in that Council) but it is not to be denied, that it was a 'meer miſtake *&c.* Again: That the Decree of the ſecond 'Council of *Nice* enjoines no Idolatry, I muſt maintain as un-'queſtionable, ſuppoſing the Premiſes. The honor we give 'to an Image is not the honor we give to the Principal, but 'only by the equivocating of terms, according to the Decree 'of the Council, and therefore that honor of Images, which 'the Decree maintaineth, is no Idolatry. And in *Juſt Weights p.* 128. 'Tho this Council acknowledgeth, that that Image 'it ſelf [of our Lord] is honoured by the honor given (be-'fore the Image) to that which it ſignifieth; yet It diſtin-'guiſheth this honor from the honor of our Lord; and there-'fore teacheth not Idolatry, by teaching to honor Images. Thus he vindicates this Council both from the cenſure of ſome Proteſtants (*Idolatry*) and from that of *Franckfort*, and the *Caroline* Books not ſo rigorous. In which Books I grant this Doctrine of Divine Worſhip given to Images to be imputed to the Greeks not only in the forementioned Chapter, but frequently elſewhere; as in 3. *l.* 24. *c.* ---4. *l.* 21. *c.* but no other proof of it any where produced, but only this paſſage of *Conſtantine* the *Cyprian* Biſhop, and their uſing the word Adoration: which, after the application of it in Scripture to inferior worſhips, nay, by the Cenſurers of *Nice*, to the Croſs; and,

and, were there none of theſe, after the Councill's explication of their innocent meaning (ſo that they can be charged only with the abuſe of a word, not error in the ſenſe) ſeems great injuſtice. And ſo alſo ſeems that, 2. *l.* 27. *c. Si omnes Imaginum adoratione cãrentes ſecundum illorum falſiſſimam opinionem pereunt, infantes Baptiſmatis unda loti, & Corporis Dominici edulio, & Sanguinis hauſtu ſatiati, qui necdum Imagines adorare valuerunt, & ſic e ſæculo migraverunt, pereunt.* And ſo the ſame Author's accuſing them for paſſing ſuch Decrees without the conſulting, or approbation, of the Apoſtolick See; when in the very beginning of the Acts of the Council the Roman Legates are the firſt that are named; and (*Act.* 2.) ſet down and recited in the Council, Pope *Adrian*'s Epiſtle maintaining the Veneration of Images.

But, however theſe things be, Catholicks ſtand both to the Decree of *Nice* and *Franckfort*; as to what the former affirms, ſo to what the later condemns; both well agreeing, both moſt orthodox; the later only erring in this, that they condemned it as the *Greeks* Opinion, of whom it is moſt manifeſt that they profeſt the contrary.

§. 27. If here it be ſaid; that the Fathers of *Franckfort* juſtly charged thoſe of *Nice* to have allowed to Images Honors truely Divine; tho they acknowledge meanwhile of them, that they denied (as alſo the Roman-Catholicks now do) thoſe Honors to be truly Divine, which they allowed, I anſwer: That then thoſe of *Franckfort*, or others ſince, ought to inſtance what particular Honor that is, given by *Nice* to Images, that is held due only to the Deity. Now firſt, for the *interior* Honor, which is given to any thing, none can cenſure others; for, this none can know; and therefore none can affirm of what ſort it is: of which thus *Spalatenſis* well (7. *l.* 12. *c.* 47. *n.*) *Diſtinctio Latriæ, Duliæ, Hyperduliæ, & aliarum inferiorum adorationum ex ſolo hominis interno pendet, quod internum non ſubſtat Eccleſiæ judicio.* And it is well gathered by him there, that it was ſomething external ſaid, or acted, by which *Serenus* perceived the *Maſſilians* to give to Images an undue Adoration Next then, for *exterior* Honor, all that I find profeſſed by thoſe of *Nice*, or objected by thoſe of *Franck-*

Franckfort, is, (not giving to them any Divine Attribute, or Virtue, not Sacrificing, or erecting Temples, Praying to them, &c, but) *osculari, amplecti, salutare*, whether by uncovering the head, or kneeling, or prostration, *oblatis perlustrare luminaribus, odoriferis thymiamatibus honorare*, besides using the term *adorare* taken in a general sense. Now none of these, or perhaps some other that may be added, could the *Franckfort* Fathers pretend due only to the Deity, because themselves gave them all, and allowed the lawfulness thereof, tho not to Images, yet to some other Creatures; to Men, to the Figure of the Cross, to the sacred Utensils, to the Holy Gospels, to Holy Relicks, to Churches, to the Emperor's Statue, and the like; and in no other manner did the *Nicene* Fathers give them to Images, than *Franckfort*, or the *Gallican* Bishops (for instance) to the Holy Cross. For Example: If the one Incensed, or set up Lights before the Cross, not imagining the Cross either saw the Lights, or scented the sweet Odours, but in Honor of Him that was Crucified upon it; so did the other before the Image of our Lord, not imagining it to see, or smell.

Such external Ceremonies of Honor, I say, the Opposers of *Nice* freely allowed to other Holy things; and meanwhile disallowed them to Images, upon such Reasons as these, which occur frequentlly in the *Caroline* Books. *Adoratio scabelli pedum Domini* was *commanded* in Scripture, not so that of Images; *Capit. Caroli. l. 2. c. 5. l. 3. c. 24.* and Adoration also of Men hath an *example* in Scripture, not so that of Images, *Ib. 1. l. 9. c.* But, if this were good arguing, neither might the *Gallican* Bishops adore the Cross, the Gospels *&c.* of which we have in Scripture neither a Command, nor Example. Again; they use Veneration of the Cross, because, *Crucis signum magnum in se habere mysterium: illud adeo esse a Redemptore mundi sacratum, ut Divini nominis invocatione illatum, alia quæque consecret & benedicat.* Which things cannot be said of Images. But neither can they of Relicks, to which yet they allow Veneration. But then concerning Relicks this Book saith, that —*Non sunt coæquandæ Imagines Reliquiis Sanctorum Martyrum & Confessorum; eo quod Reliquiæ* §. 28.

quiæ aut de Corpore ſunt, aut de his quæ circa Corpus: l.3. c.24. but ſo neither is the Croſs or Sacred Utenſils *de Corpore*, or *circa Corpus*; yet are they venerable. But then they have another reaſon for the veneration of Sacred Utenſils, which will not ſuit to Images; for ---*Sine Imaginibus, & lavacri unda, & ſacri liquoris unctio percipi, & thymiamata adoleri, & luminaribus loca ſancta perluſtrari, & Corporis ac Sanguinis Dominici conſecratio effici poteſt, ſine vaſis vero nunquam.* But what then? May not that be in ſome other reſpect venerable that is not in this; as the Croſs, the Goſpel, and Holy Relicks are? And, as other things have a relation to ſacred Perſons, for which they become venerable, that is not applicable to Images; ſo Images have a ſpecial relation, namely that they afford a lively repreſentation to our minds of the Exemplar or Prototype, which the others do not. From which it would be a weak arguing to conclude, therefore Images only venerable, not they. So, for the veneration of *Baſilicas* and Churches, they have another reaſon. *Aliud eſt loca divinis cultibus mancipata luminaribus perluſtrari* [*i. e.* in the day time alſo] *& in eiſdem locis & orationum & thymiamatum Deo* [which muſt be underſtood not as any ſpecial external Cult now required by him] *fumum offerri*; *& aliud Imagini oculos habenti & nihil cernenti lumen offerre, & nares habenti & nihil odoranti, thymiamata adolere*; *aliud eſt loca divino cultui mancipata venerari, aliud picturis luminaria & thymiamata offerre.* Thus the *Capitulare*. But then as ſuch Lights and Incenſe are uſed within Churches *in honorem Dei & Chriſti*, to whom ſuch Churches are conſecrated (yet, I ſuppoſe, without any reference to the Divine Sight or Olfaction) and not in any honor of the ſenſleſs wood and ſtone of ſuch Fabricks; ſo are the ſame things uſed before the Images of Chriſt *&c.* that are ſet in theſe Churches, *in honorem Prototypi*, which ſees, and ſmells, and not in any honor of the ſenſleſs matter and colours of ſuch Images, or Painters work. And much-what like things are there ſaid of the reſt. Add to theſe things in the *Capitulare*, what *Bellarmin* (in *Append. de Cultu Imaginum* 4. c.) relates out of the latter Synod (as they call it) at *Paris*: *Multa teſtimonia proferentes pro adoratione Crucis, cum rationem reddere volunt, cur ſignum*

vel

vel lignum Crucis adorandum ſit, & non ſint adorandæ Imagines Chriſti, dicunt eam eſſe cauſam; quia Chriſtus in Cruce ſuſpenſus fuit, non in Imagine; & quia per Crucem nos redemit, non per Imaginem. To which he: *Certe Chriſtus non in ſigno Crucis, aut in ligneis illis crucibus, quæ adorantur in Eccleſiis, ſuſpenſus eſt. Cum ergo liceat per adverſarios Crucis Imaginem colere, cur Imaginem Crucifixi colere non licebit?* Now therefore, when in thus much the *Franckfort* Fathers are agreed with the *Nicene*, That the Croſs and Relicks &c. may have the external veneration, which the *Nicene* allow alſo to Images, no ſuch exterior ſigns or ſymbols of Honor may be ſtiled Divine Worſhip, or due only to the Deity: At leaſt neither Eaſt nor Weſt, neither the *Nicene*, nor *Anti-Nicene* Biſhops of thoſe times thought them ſo. And this, ſuppoſing the worſt, that ſuch worſhip external or internal, were miſ-applied to Images, yet ſo long as it held lawfully communicable to ſome other Creature, extream folly and nonſence there may be in ſuch miſplacing it, but can be no Idolatry. No *Idololatria* or *Iconodulia*, if you will, becauſe no *latria* or *dulia*; as on the other ſide, ſuch worſhip, as, if given to ſome creature, is Divine, can be exhibited to no other creature at all without Idolatry. And the Author of the *Capitulare*, in charging the *Nicene* Fathers with giving *Divine* Worſhip to Images, yet doth not, that I can find, any where charge them for it with *Idolatry*, but with *ſegnities*, *inſania*, and the like; (which, methinks, might teach ſome late Writers that modeſty in their language toward the preſent both Weſt and Eaſtern Churches, which theſe obſerved toward the Eaſtern only.) And *l.* 3. *c.* 16. he ſeems to free the learned among the Greeks from any great error in it. *Nam etſi a doctis quibuſque* (ſaith he) *vitari poſſit hoc, quod illi in adorandis imaginibus exercent, qui* viz. *non qui ſint* [quid], *ſed quid innuant, venerantur, indoctis tamen quibuſque ſcandalum generant, qui nihil aliud in his, præter id quod vident, venerantur & adorant.* But then, why is not the Controverſy a little mollified and reduced to this, whether all Veneration, or alſo uſe of ſacred Pictures were better to be by all laid aſide, than ſuch a groſs miſtake by any incurred?

§. 29. This of thoſe whether the *Caroline* Books, or Divines of *Franckfort*, or of *Paris*, aſſembled ſome thirty years after *Franckfort* under *Ludovicus Pius*, who denying ſuch Honors lawful to be exhibited to Images, yet freely gave the very ſame to other ſacred things; by which ſuch external acts of honor are cleared from neceſſarily being, or ſignifying in themſelves any Divine Worſhip. Where it is obſervable, that *Daille* in his Treatiſe of Images, *l.* 4. *c.* 3. tho he ſaith of the *Nicene* Fathers, that in denying to give any Divine Honor to Images, yet notwithſtanding they actually gave to them thoſe which were ſo: (For, ſaith he ---*ſe proſternere*, to proſtrate our ſelves, to be uncovered, to hold up our hands as an act of humility, to make prayers, to offer incenſe, and lights, are not theſe ſervices, we render to God?) and tho he ſpends a whole Chapter, *Ibid. c.* 6. in juſtifying the Synod of *Paris* that cenſures *Nice* and Pope *Adrian* (yet makes no mention at all of any cenſure of *Franckfort* againſt them) againſt *Bellarmin*'s reflections upon it, Yet, when he comes to the main Point, and that whereon the Cardinal chiefly inſiſteth, ---*Quod ſuperat omnem admirationem, illud eſt, quod multa teſtimonia proferunt pro adoratione Crucis. Cum ergo liceat per adverſarios Crucis imaginem colere, cur imaginem Crucifixi colere non licebit?* And, ---*At inquiunt nihil manu factum colere fas eſt. Quid igitur* (ſaith he) *Lignum vel ſignum Crucis non eſt manu factum? Codex Evangeliorum, & ſacra vaſa, quæ horum opinione veneranda ſunt, quid ſunt aliud niſi opera manuum humanarum? Et tamen verum eſt, nihil manu factum eſſe colendum eo genere cultus, quo Deus ipſe, qui omnino non eſt factus, ſed omnium rerum factor colendus.* To this the main Objection, and ſo much, you ſee, preſſed by the Cardinal, I ſay *Daille* in that Treatiſe, (as alſo Proteſtant Writers ordinarily,) returns no Anſwer; paſſeth it over in ſilence, and takes care his Reader hear nothing of it; and ſo doth a late Author that goes as high as any in his charge. For, indeed, what can he, or they, ſay to it? But that ſuch Idolaters as the Accuſed were, ſuch alſo the Accuſers: ſuch as the Orientals in reſpect of Images, ſuch the *Gallican*, *German*, or *Brittanick* Clergy, in reſpect of other things: finally the whole Church, then, Idolaters. And what matters it, whether

whether ſuch in reſpect of the Images of our Lord, or thoſe of the Croſs? hanging lights, or burning ſweet odours before the one, or the other? And to what purpoſe labour they to ſhew ſome part of the Weſt oppoſite to the Eaſt, as to veneration of Images, when they have both theſe united, againſt themſelves, as to Adoration of, and uſing, all thoſe outward ceremonies of Honor to the Croſs, as the other do to Images?

Leaving then both Eaſt and Weſt under their heavy charge of *Idolatry*, as to the Croſs, and Holy Goſpels *&c*, let us ſee now in what particular of thoſe Honors generally exhibited to theſe a Proteſtant can verify it. They cannot ſurely in theſe; their being uncovered, kiſſing, embracing, kneeling, proſtration, (I name not praying to them, for, that is generally diſclaimed) for theſe are no Ceremonies of Worſhip appropriated to the Deity; but lawfully exhibited to Creatures. But if perhaps they ſhall pitch upon the *lumina. ria & ſuffita*, lights or ſweet odours (or, if any other may be named ſuch like) that they are expreſſions of reſpect and honor only applicable to the Deity, upon what ground can this be ſaid? §. 30.

For the Firſt, *Lights*: In ſetting forth a ſhew with the greater pomp, Proteſtants as well as Catholicks, think they lawfully uſe them. In times of ſolemn Joy we make Bonfires; we uſe Torches in Funerals, not all or always for neceſſity, but in honor of the Deceaſed; and in particular they are the fitteſt Emblems of the preſent ſplendor and glory of our Lord and his Saints in Heaven whoſe Images (but in relation to the Perſon repreſented) we honor with them. [*Erat lucerna ardens*, ſaith our Lord of the Baptiſt] They were uſed anciently, and that on the day time, at the reading of the Holy Goſpel, which was delivered to us by the *Lux Mundi* our Lord: a Cuſtome defended by St. *Jerome* againſt *Vigilantius*; ---*Per totas Orientis Eccleſias, Epiſt. contra Vigilantium* (ſaith he) *quando legendum eſt Evangelium, accenduntur lucernæ, jam ſole rutilante*: [and this reaſon given] *non ad fugandas tenebras, ſed ad ſignum lætitiæ demonſtrandum.* §. 31.

And *Rivet*, in his Debates with *Grotius*; *Exam. Animad.* Grot. *Art.* 21. acknowledgeth the ancient Christians to have met the Statues of their Christian Emperors (brought into Cities as it were to receive their homage, where the Emperor could not come in person) *cum cereis & incensis*, with lights, and burning sweet odours, to express a Civil Honor to the Persons these represented: a Custome mentioned also in 2. *Nicene* Council, *Act.* 1. *Si enim Regum laureata & Iconas missas ad civitates vel regiones obvii adeunt populi cum Cereis & incensis, non cera perfusam tabulam, sed Imperatorem honorantes* &c. Concerning this thus *Bellarmin*, *De Reliquiis* 2. *l.* 3. *c.* declares the Catholick's intention. *Non offerri cereas Martyribus, tanquam sacrificia, sed accendi in signum lætitiæ. Ignem enim accendi solere ad lætitiam significandam in rebus profanis: præterea ignem, Gloriæ signum esse; unde Imperatoribus Romanis ubique Ignis præferebatur.* And in the 2. *Nicene* Council, *Act.* 4. we find both them and sweet odours, thus defended and expounded, *Epist. Germani ad Episc. Claudiopol*; —*Sed nec illud scandalizet quosdam, quod, ante Imagines Sanctorum, luminarium concinnatio, & suavis odoris thymiamata fiunt*; *symbolice namque talia celebrari ad honorem eorum excogitata sunt* &c. *Indicia sunt namque sensibilia lumina divini ac sine materia luminis dati* [sanctis in cælo]: *porro Aromatum incensum purissimæ & totius S. Spiritus inspirationis & repletionis insigne.* And St. *Austine* long ago in the 27*th* Chapter of his 8*th* Book *De Civitate Dei*, Entitled *De modo honoris quem Christiani Martyribus impendant*, speaking of such Ceremonies used at the Memorials, or Sepulchers, or Reliquaries of the Martyrs: —*Quæcunque igitur* (saith he) *adhibentur Religiosorum obsequia in Martyrum locis, ornamenta sunt Memoriarum, non sacra vel sacrificia mortuorum tanquam Deorum.*

§. 32 For the Second, *Burning sweet Odours:* It it granted, that as the sacrificing of Beasts, so the fuming of Incense joyned with certain circumstances of its being offered upon the fire of the Altar, by a Priest, of such a composition &c. was under the Law a Ceremony of the Divine Worship not communicable, nor lawful to be performed, upon whatever rectified

fied intention, to any other. But yet among the Jews, as the killing of Beaſts alſo for food, ſo the burning of Incenſe or ſweet Odours, diveſted of ſuch circumſtances, was never prohibited to be uſed otherwiſe than only in the Divine Service. Uſe all manner of Perfumes on any occaſion the people might, only this excepted, that they ſhould not be of the ſame compoſition with that of the Sanctuary, *Exod.* 30. 37, 38. Now the Church is far from uſing ſuch perfuming with any ſuch circumſtances as may give it the appearance of a Sacrifice, or ſuch Oblation of it as was made to God under the Law; for, ſhe acknowledgeth none, neither that of Beaſts, nor of Incenſe, nor any other, lawful now under the Goſpel to be offered in this manner, either to any other, or to God himſelf, ſave only that of the Body and Blood of our Lord in the Euchariſt; the other being Levitical, typical, aboliſhed Rites. She alſo abhorrs the uſe of *it* (as alſo ſhe doth of any other the leaſt common Honor, any kneeling, or bowing) as it was required of the ancient Chriſtians to the Heathen, Gods, or Emperors, or their Statues, *i. e.* with an Altar erected before ſuch Statue, a Fire kindled on It, and Incenſe to be caſt thereon, or at the leaſt impoſed upon them as an external acknowledgment, or confeſſion of their believing ſome Divinity in the Perſon, to whom it was offered. She only uſeth ſuch Odours as a common Ceremony of Honor, frequent in times of Joy, to entertain the Smell, as Lights and Bonfires do the Eyes; Hymns, Muſick and ringing of Bells, the Ears. And when uſed in the Divine Service, it is ſo not only by the Prieſt (the proper *Miniſter* of a *Sacrifice*) but inferior Miniſters; who incenſe or perfume therewith, not only the Altars and Images of Saints, but the Book of the Goſpels, the Prieſt and other Clergy, and the people. *In Eccleſia* (ſaith *Bellarmin, De Imag.* 2. l. 17. c.) *non-Sacerdotes incenſum offerunt, idque non ſolum Deo, ſed etiam populo:* See the Rubricks in *Ordo Miſſæ.* So that, if the Saints in Glory be Deified by ſuch a Ceremony, ſo are the People, and the Books too. Several ends of the Church's uſing it *Bellarm. De Miſſa,* 2. *l.* 15. *c.* names, ſuch as theſe: ---*Ut ſignificetur bonus odor Evangelii,* 2. Cor. 2. 15. *Chriſti bonus odor ſumus Deo. Ut ſignificentur orationes Sanctorum,* Rev. 5. 8. and, amongſt

mongſt others; *Ut teter odor, ſi quis ex multitudine hominum in Eccleſia exiſteret, abſtergatur.* And Thurifications or waſting ſweet Odours on this manner, methinks, ſhould be no more ſuſpected of Idolatry, than ſprinkling Holy Water. We find mention of theſe two laſt *thymiama & luminaria* in the *4th* Canon Apoſtolical, and proviſion for theſe numbred amongſt the Oblations allowed to be brought to the Altar: And theſe Canons, in the Proteſtant's judgment, ſurely as ancient as *Conſtantine*'s days. And *Daille, De Relig. cult. objecto* 2. *l.* 15. *c.* with his Negative Arguments contending ſuch Cuſtomes to have bin unknown to the ancient Chriſtians, yet extends this purity of the Church in the ignorance of them no further, than till the beginning of the *4th* Century, the times of *Conſtantine*; that is no further, than till the Church, lifting up her head out of long Perſecutions, had the firſt opportunity to honor her Martyrs with a greater external Solemnity and Triumph. About which times ſuppoſing, not granting, that ſhe had borrowed and adopted theſe emblematical Ceremonies into her Service out of Gentiliſme, yet a rectified intention purifies the external action; and *David* made no ſcruple of uſing the ſpoils of the Heathen for the more adorning the Houſe of God. And, if the Chriſtians may not uſe at pleaſure what Paganiſme hath formerly abuſed, nor honor God's Saints with any thing formerly applied to Idols, then neither may they with *bowing* to them, for this the Heathen did to their Idols: nor, for the ſame reaſon, may Proteſtants retain any Cuſtomes ſuppoſed formerly abuſed by the Roman Church. Laſtly, if theſe two of Lights and Perfume ſhall amount to Idolatry, ſo *Idolatry* will be introduced into the Church in the times of *Conſtantine*, and ſo an hundred years before the Proteſtant account, and extremely diſorder their Calculations about the fourty two Months, or 1260. years of Anti-Chriſt's Reign: Neither will this leave that Church, which our Lord promiſed Hell Gates ſhould not prevail againſt, one minutes reſpite as it were, but remove it immediatly from the Captivity under Heathen *Rome*, and Idolatry without the Church, to that Captivity much greater under the Chriſtian Anti-Chriſt (as they ſtile him), and Idolatry, within it. Meanwhile, this is willingly granted,

That

That to incenſe or burn lights before any Image or other Creature whatever with ſome of thoſe miſ-apprehenſions mentioned before §. 4, *&c.* is an act of Idolatry, as burning Incenſe to the Brazen Serpent was, if done upon any ſuch ſuperſtitious account, or in any ſuch way as God under the Law required it only to himſelf: and therefore this Serpent was removed and broken by *Hezekiah*, 2. *King.* 18. 4. But ſo alſo was it Idolatry to bow the knee to the ſame Serpent. Now, all ſuch ſuperſtitious intention in incenſing Images, the Croſs, the Goſpels and the like, do Catholicks renounce, and profeſs whatever is offered at, to, or before, ſuch Images, as Perfume, Lights, Tablets, *&c.* to have relation only to the Dignity of the Perſon repreſented, and not to any at all in the Image, and to be uſed as expreſſions of Joy and Gratitude, or honorary Ornaments of it meerly for the Exemplar's ſake, or alſo as Memorials and Monuments of ſome Benefits received by the Supplicants from him.

Thus I have ſhewed the *Gallican* Biſhops to have given the ſelf ſame veneration to Croſſes and other ſacred things, as the *Nicene* did to Images; and have vindicated both of them from giving to ſacred things, in theſe external Ceremonies uſed toward them, any Divine Honor; as alſo the ancient Chriſtians in their uſing the like to the Statues of their Emperors. And ſo have cleared this matter, as, That the Fathers of the Council of *Nice* expreſly denied their giving any *Latria* or Divine Worſhip to Images; ſo, that no particular Note or ſign of Worſhip exhibited by them to Images can be proved ſuch: And conſequently, that, in the condemning of thoſe, who (to uſe the words of *Franckfort*) *Imagines Sanctorum, ita ut Deificam Trinitatem ſervitio aut adoratione impendunt*, both thoſe of *Nice* and *Franckfort* in their Decree perfectly agree.

But now, in the laſt place, ſuppoſing ſome difference or oppoſition between the Decrees of theſe two Councils; the one of them denying, not a Divine, but any Adoration or Veneration at all lawful to be given to Images (yet which doth not appear,) the other affirming it: let us examine to which rather of theſe, diſagreeing, Chriſtians do regularly and canonically owe their ſubmiſſion and obedience. §. 33.

First

First, then, It is clear concerning the former of them, the Council of *Nice*; that, whatever it was in it self, when held, or, how much soever that of *Franckfort* following in the West (supposed opposite to it) might derogate from the universality of it, yet that it was received, and admitted afterward for a General Council in the Council of *Florence*, *Sess.* 5. *Ferrar.* even by all the Western Provinces, as well as by the Eastern; *nemine contradicente*; and therefore, since such reception at least, obligeth as General. But the acceptation of the Decrees thereof by the West, long before the Council of *Florence*, appears by the general Practices there, for many Ages before the rise of *Luther*, in the *same* Veneration of Images with the other, (some stick not to say, *greater*). Yet higher, that the 8*th* Council, held, within a hundred years after this Council, acknowledgeth and ratifieth this as the 7*th* Council, and reiterates particularly the same Decree concerning Veneration of Images. See *Can.* 3. thereof. ---*Sacram Imaginem Domini nostri Jesu Christi æquo honore cum libro Sanctorum Evangeliorum adorari decernimus. Dignum est enim, ut secundum congruentiam rationis & antiquissimam traditionem propter honorem, qui ad principalia ipsa refertur, etiam derivativæ Imagines honorentur, ut Sanctorum Evangeliorum sacer liber: atque typus pretiosæ Crucis.* The 8*th* Council, I say, whether the *Photian*, or *Anti-Photian*, Council be taken for it (of which see what Dr. *Stillingfl.* saith in *Rom. Idol.* §. 16.) for both of these confirmed this, as the 7*th* General Council. See *Concil. Photian. Act.* 5. *apud Baron. An. Dom.* 879.

§. 34. 2*ly*, Clear, that as the *Grecian* Bishops, and the Patriarch of *Constantinople* were present there, so all the other Oriental Patriarchs, hindred by the *Saracene* Persecution from coming in person, sent their Legates thither, and with this Council concurred in their Judgment. For, thus saith the Epistle of the *Palestine* Hermites recited in the Council *Act.* 3. that from *John* and *Thomas*, who were delegated to the Council from those parts, *habebitis trium Apostolicorum thronorum concordem sententiam, & concinentem concordiam, qui* ---*illam* [Synodum] *quam septimam dicunt* [*i. e.* under *Constantinus Copronymus* against Images] *non modo non recipiunt, sed uno animo*

animo & voce deteſtantur. Again, the Declaration concerning Images, recited in this Letter, accordingly is taken to be the ſentiment of the Oriental Patriarchs, and not of theſe Hermites only, by the whole Council, as is ſeen by their ſeveral ſpeeches upon it. *Benedictus eſt Deus, quod Orientis Sanctiſſimi Præſules in confeſſione adorationis Imaginum venerandarum conſoni cum* Adriano &c. *inventi ſunt.* ---*Cum videam literas, quas ab Orientali Diœceſi Sanctiſſimi Archiepiſcopi ad Tharaſium reſcripſerunt* &c. *Literis ab Orientalibus Archipræſulibus* &c. *acquieſco:* no notice being taken of the Hermites, which implies them in this matter only to have bin theſe Prelate's Inſtruments. And ſo this Declaration was taken to be by the *Caroline* Books, which urge ſome paſſages of this Letter about Images, as *ſententiam fidei* Theodori *Archiepiſcopi* Hieroſolymitani. Of which *Theodore* alſo *Adrian* in his Anſwer to theſe Books teſtifies thus (2. *Cap. Act.* 3.) *Iſte cum cæteris præcipuis Patriarchis*, viz. Coſma Alexandriæ, *&* Theodoro *alio* Antiochiæ *dudum Prædeceſſori noſtro* ---Paulo *Papæ miſerunt propriam eorum rectæ fidei Synodicam.* To which may be added the Accuſation, which the *Nicene* Council bringeth againſt the former Council under *Conſtantinus Copronymus*, for this defect therein (*Act.* 6. *Tom.* 1.) *Quinetiam neque concordantes ſibi habuit Orientis Patriarchas*, Alexandrinum, *inquam*, Antiochenum, *& Urbis Sanctæ ſummos Pontifices* &c. With what boldneſs is this done, and how eaſily retorted, if themſelves at the ſame time were in the ſame default? To conclude; this Seventh Council is alſo found to be afterward confirmed by the Legates of theſe Eaſtern Patriarchs in the 8*th* General Council (take whether you will, the *Photian*, pretended by the Greeks, or the *Anti-Photian* affirmed by the Latines) which ſee in their Acts.

3*ly*, Manifeſt alſo, that this Council was ſubſcribed likewiſe, as to its Definitions about Images, by the Roman Legates; and confirmed, and afterward alſo defended, againſt the *Capitulare*, by *Adrian* the then Biſhop of *Rome* (this is out of diſpute on all ſides): and by him not ſtanding alone, but adhered to by ſome part at leaſt of the Weſtern Church; as *Baronius* obſerves out of *Hinchmar. Epiſcopus Rhemenſis* §. 35.

 contr.

contr. Laudun. Episc. 20.c.; and as may be collected from the Decrees of several Western Councils before this of *Nice*, recited before §. 22. whereas there met in that of *Franckfort* only the Bishops from *France* and *Germany* (tho these in a great number) and some Bishops from the North part of *Italy* such as were under the dominions of *Carolus Magnus* and nearer to *Franckfort*. Neither was it confirmed by the Bishop of *Rome*, whose consent, as necessary, *Charles*'s Books urge against that of *Nice*: Not confirmed by him, I say, as to this point, supposing this Synod decreed any thing against Veneration of Images: or concerning the Error of *Nice* in such their Decree. Of which (as hath bin said before) this may be a sufficient proof, that the same Pope owned the Confirmation of the Decree of *Nice* for Images, defended it against the *Capitulare*, and is inveighed against by the Episcopal Meeting at *Paris* under *Ludovicus Pius* twenty four years after *Franckfort*, for his justifying, and weakly maintaining the *Nicene* Decree; whenas of his later confirmation of a contrary Decree of *Franckfort*, had there bin any such thing, which also could not be unknown to them, they might have made great advantage. This of *Franckfort* therefore, being supposed to have made a contrary Decree concerning Image-Worship to that of *Nice* (as indeed it hath not) yet being herein unconfirmed, nay dissented from by the Occidental Patriarch, and all the Oriental, by part of the Western Prelacy also then, and by the whole Western Clergy since, who in later Ages have received the other as General, can no way stand in competition with that of *Nice* confirmed by all the Patriarchs; and, in later Ages at least, received as General by all the Western, as well as Eastern, Clergy; nor can we rationally doubt, to which of these we owe Obedience.

§. 36. Thus we have seen the Decree of *Nice* concerning Image-Worship (referred to by *Trent*) as well Negative for *Latria*, as Affirmative for an *inferior* Veneration, such as is of other Holy things; when therefore that superior honor is spoken of, either *latria*, or *dulia*, that is given, and due, to the Exemplar, either the internal honor of the Soul, or external of the Body; [for, note, that the *Latria* or Divine Worship consists

conſiſts of both, and the external act receives its ſpecification from the internal, and not one, but both theſe we equally give to our Lord then alſo, when one prays to him, not before, but without, an Image] I ſay, when this ſuperior Worſhip is ſpoken of, tho here, we uncover our heads, kneel, or proſtrate our ſelves before an Image, nay kiſs alſo and embrace it, yet is the Image neither *objectum*, nor *ratio adorationis*, but only *adjunctum*, as the Cardinal, *De Imag.* 2. *l.* 23 *c.* hath it; a circumſtantial, an inductive, a motive thereof. For, the mental intention is ſuppoſed here wholly to direct (as it can, at pleaſure) theſe *outward* notes of Honor (ſome of which are accidentally and concomitantly applied to the Image, but without any purpoſe of honouring It thereby) to the Prototype; and the kiſs or embracing of it, and immediatly touching it, is, in ſuch worſhip, mentally no more intended to it, than the kneeling, proſtration, or prayers, which as it is, then, made before it, ſo is made at another time, in the very ſame manner, and intention, to the Prototype without it. Neither is ſuch external Latrical worſhip imagined to be conveyed to the perſon repreſented, either *by*, or *through*, the Image, as a *Medium* to it; but the Image is a meer circumſtance of ſuch Adoration; as time, and place, are, and any Creature of God may be; yet a circumſtance much more beneficial for reminding us of ſuch duty, as alſo for rendring this ſervice more fix'd and ſteddy, or intenſe and devout, than others be. And in this ſenſe is the Synod of *Metz* to be underſtood, held *An. Dom.* 1549. after the beginning of the Reformation, and in the ſuſpenſion of that of *Trent*, for ſetling the new Controverſies in Religion: which concerning Images ſpeaks plainly thus, *Cap.* 41. —*Non proponuntur Imagines in Eccleſia ut adoremus eas, & colamus, ſed ut per eas quid orare, colere, venerari & imitari debeamus, admoneamur. Non ut colamus*, i. e. *cultu Latriæ*; [for certainly ſuch a veneration and reverent treatment of them as *ſacrorum uſorum* theſe Fathers denied not.] In explication of which they uſe this Simile as *Vaſquez*, *In* 3. *Thom. Diſput.* 108. *c.* 14. cites their words out of another Copy that contains their Acts more at large than that in *Binius*; —*Codicem oculis perluſtrans, cum ad Venerabile & tremendum Nomen Jeſu devenerit*

rit, caput aperit, inclinatur, & ſuſpirans in cœlum oculos attollit [ſo do Proteſtants] *&, ob id, omni reprehenſione, & Idololatriæ ſuſpicione caret, ſiquidem non literas* &c. *ſic honorat, ſed cogitatione & veneratione mentis ſuæ ad eum honorandum & adorandum rapitur, cujus memoriam hæ literæ ei ſuggerunt. Cur ergo ſuperſtitionis aut Idololatriæ reus peragitur, qui ante imaginem crucifixi Domini caput aperit, aut procumbens adorat, cum nequaquam imaginem putet adorandam* [i.e. *latria*, the Cult both exterior, and interior, he then gives to our Lord, juſt ſo, as, before, the other did at the ſight of his name] *ſed eum corde veneretur & adoret, quem pro ſe natum, paſſum* &c, *recordatur.* But here it is not denyed, That the ſame numerical external mark of honor may truly be ſaid to reſpect, and may be lawfully exhibited at the ſame time to, both the *Image*, and the *Exemplar*, if here accompanied with a double internal intention; one higher, reſpecting the Prototype, and another inferior, reſpecting the Image: As the ſame putting of our hat, and being uncovered, may be performed at once to the Prince, and to our Father attending upon him: but, doubtleſs, with a much different internal honor. So was the external bowing of the people but one, when they are ſaid to have therewith worſhiped God, and the King. 1. *Chron.* 29. 20. And of ſuch outward Cult it is truly ſaid, *Eundem eſſe poſſe in Imaginem, & Exemplar.* This of the Councils touching this Subject.

§. 37. For the Schoolmen, tho no Catholicks are obliged to juſtify, or adhere to their expreſſions in this matter, or diſcuſs their ſubtilties; and ſome have bin very free alſo in the cenſure of ſome of them, as dangerous, and alſo hardly intelligible, See *Bellarm. De Imag. l.* 2. *c.* 22. §. 4. (and ſo the uncurious may, omitting what follows, paſs on to §. 40.); yet the later Schoolmen, to whoſe hands the Acts of this ſecond *Nicene* Council have come, have generally conformed to its language, and have taken much pains alſo to reduce the *varii modi loquendi* of their Predeceſſors to the ſame intention and meaning; who are ſuppoſed not to have ſeen this Decree, becauſe they have not mentioned it; and who, upon a Philoſophical Maxime, That *idem eſt motus in Imaginem & Exemplar*, have

uſed

uſed expreſſions ſomewhat different from it, and apt to be miſtaken. *Eſtius* ſaith of St. *Thomas*, In 3. *Sent. Diſt.* 9. §. 3. *Probabile eſt S.* Thomam *hanc Concilii definitionem non legiſſe, quam ſi legiſſet, aliter de Cruce, & Imagine Chriſti adoratione fuiſſet locutus.* And *Bellarm. De Imag.* c. 22. *Valde credibile S.* Thomam *& alios Doctores Scholaſticos illius temporis non vidiſſe* Nicænam *Synodum ſecundam, neque octavam Synodum Generalem, neque Epiſtolam* Hadriani *Papæ pro defenſione Synodi* Nicænæ. *Nam hæc omnia longo tempore latuerunt, & hoc noſtro ſæculo primum edita ſunt.* And, *Ibid.* he ſaith ſince theſe known: *Cur ergo, quæſo, non loquimur, ut Patres noſtri loquuntur?* And *Vaſquez*, In 3. *Thom. Diſp.* 109. *c.* 3. in vindication of St. *Thomas*, and other former Schoolmen ſaith; —*Nullus Scholaſticorum ſic loquitur: Imagini Chriſti, aut Trinitatis, Latria* [he means *latria* taken in its ſtrict ſenſe, for *ſubmiſſio animi*, or *ſervitus in affectu conſiſtens*] *tribuenda eſt.* And, —*Qui diceret, ſe exhibere latriam Imaginibus, quæ eſt divina ſervitus in affectu ſolo conſiſtens, concederet eo ipſo, ſe Imaginibus tanquam Diis ſervire.* It is true, that *Vaſquez* himſelf uſeth this language; *Eadem adoratione cum exemplari Imagines eſſe adorandas:* but he declares his meaning to be *eadem adoratione* i. e. *externa*, as *inclinatione corporis, genuflectione, quam exhibemus etiam Exemplari in Latria*; but not, *eadem adoratione interna*, i. e. *ſubmiſſione animi & ſervitute, tanquam bono ſummo & excellentiſſimo:* which internal ſubmiſſion is the *Latria* proper only to God; but the external notes we uſe thereof are common alſo to others. Now, to give any ſuch interior Adoration *i. e. ſubmiſſa animi tanquam excellentiori*, tho the loweſt or leaſt that can be imagined, to an *inanimate picture*, Vaſquez, in defence of his Opinion, ſaith very truly, and ſo muſt all Catholicks with him, that any ſuch perſon *agit perverſe, & abjecto animo*; and may rightly be called either *Iconolatra*, in the yielding ſuch ſubmiſſion to an Image *tanquam bono ſummo & excellentiſſimo*; or *Iconodulos*, if as *ſe excellentiori*. But herein is *Vaſquez* cenſured by others, as miſtaken; that he thought all inferior honor and veneration to be neceſſarily ſuch a ſubmiſſion *tanquam excellentiori*. Meanwhile a late Proteſtant Writer, *Stillingfl. Rom. Idol. c.* 11. §. 11. *p.* 184. hath very untandidly made

uſe

uſe of this paſſage of his to ſhew Catholicks confeſſed to be Idolaters, whether they ſay, they give a ſupreme, or whether an inferior, worſhip to Images, even by the teſtimony of their own Writers. For (as he urgeth) *Bellarmin* ſaith; to give *Latria*, or the ſupreme and ſelf ſame Worſhip that is given God to an Image is Idolatry (which, as ſaid by *Bellarmin*, ſo is granted): and then *Vaſquez* (he citing this Paſſage) ſaith, that he who gives an inferior worſhip diſtinct from the Prototype to an Image is alſo an Idolater. Thus that Author. But, for this later, *Vaſquez* firſt reſtrains the inferior worſhip, he ſpeaks of, to *ſubmiſſio animi*, and *ſervitus tanquam excellentiori*; and, next, ſaith, that ſuch a one is either *Iconolatra, i. e.* if he gives it to ſuch a thing as ſuperlatively excellent; [but then ſuch worſhip given to an Image *tanquam bono ſummo & excellentiſſimo* cannot rightly be called an inferior worſhip; or if called ſo, Catholicks in ſuch a ſenſe renounce it and grant it to be Idolatry.] Or he is *Iconodulos*: which later is moſt true, and, as ſaid by *Vaſquez*, ſo will not be denied by *Bellarmin*, or any other rational perſon. Thus then a ſupreme worſhip given to Images (according to *Bellarmin*) is Idolatry: and an inferior Worſhip alſo given to Images, (according to a ſenſe *Vaſquez* gives of it) is Iconolatry. Whilſt meanwhile an inferior worſhip given to Images in the Catholick's ſenſe thereof neither exhibited to them *ut bono excellentiſſimo*, nor *excellentiori ſe*, is very innocent and lawful. Of which ſenſe of *Vaſquez* thus Cardinal *Lugo*, *De Incarnatione Diſp.* 36. §. 3. *n.* 36. *Non poſſumus prudenter concipere illam prorſus adorationem reſpectu Imaginis, quæ ſubmittimus nos illi, præferentes illam nobis: hoc enim eſſet ſtultum mendacium, quia abſolute loquendo meliores ſumus nos, quam Imago S.* Petri. *Ergo prudenter operando debemus nosmetipſos præferre imagini tanquam digniores & excellentiores. Nemo ergo poteſt dicere, quod adoratio Imaginis includat etiam talem internam ſubmiſſionem; nec de hoc poteſt eſſe rationabilis controverſia.* But then: by the inferior honor or worſhip, not only external, but interior alſo, that is allowed by Catholicks to Images, is not meant any ſuch ſubmiſſion, as to a thing more excellent than the honourer, as *Vaſquez* ſuppoſeth; but only a certain internal eſteem of it, as well as external

eternal respect to it, for some nearer relation it hath (as a Picture hath by its similitude) to some Person, that is honoured by us as more excellent than our selves; which our esteem of the Exemplar we have a mind to shew, not to the Picture, but to others, or also to the Exemplar it self, by the external gestures and civilities we perform to, or before, his Image: of which I shall speak more particularly below §. 49. without which internal intention of shewing such exterior reverent treatment of such Image, the external treatment it self seems insignificant. And therefore *Suarez* thus censures this Opinion: That thus no honor at all is indeed allowed to the Image, the external note signifying nothing, when standing single, and no internal intention of reverence or esteem at all to the same thing accompanying it. See him in 3. *Thom. Disp.* 54. §. 3. *Si interna intentio cultus non cadit in imaginem, sed sola actio exterior* [or *externa nota cultus*] *circa illam versatur, ex intentione colendi Exemplar, ex ea non solum sequitur, Imagines minus coli, quam Exemplaria, sed etiam sequitur, illas non coli.* Thus *Vasquez* and St. *Thomas*, and other ancient Schoolmen, whose expressions he defends, according to the sense he gives them, in seeming to say so much beyond the Conciliary Decree of *Nice*, are thought to say nothing at all; or less, than must be said to justify the truth of this Decree *viz.* That there is not only an empty external note, but also some interior and real honor and respect due, and given to, Images.

To relate any further the Schoolmen's Expressions for shewing them innocent and harmless in this point, would be only to embroil a matter which seems of it self sufficiently clear; and the rather may be spared here, because one would think no such diligence necessary to perswade that, I say not some ignorant persons, but the most learned in the Roman Church, should downright affirm Divine Worship due to a Creature, and that inanimate, and scarce a substance. On this matter thus Mr. *Thorndike*; 'To say that the Image of our Lord is 'to be honoured as He is, is perfect Idolatry. But he, who 'believes the Son to be of the Father's substance [as all the Schoolmen do] and his Picture to be his Picture [as all mankind do] cannot say so if he be in his wits.' Thus Mr. *Thorndike*. §. 38.

alike. Who then can eaſily believe ſuch a thing of them, who are granted to acknowledge neither any peculiar Divine Preſence to ſuch Image, nor any other virtue in it: and expreſly grant, that he who worſhips our Lord with *latria* before an Image, does no more give ſuch honor to the Image, than he, that worſhips the King with *Regal* Honor, gives the ſame regal honor alſo to his Cloaths, to his Robes, to his Purple, to his Crown that he wears (a Simile often uſed, yet not deviſed by the Schoolmen, but borrowed from St. *Epiphanius*, In *Anchorato*, and from St. *Auſtine*, *De Verbis Domini Serm.* 58.): Or no more than he, that bows to our Lord at the naming of *Jeſus*, or at the producing, or reading the Goſpels, worſhips in the ſame manner the Book of the Goſpels; or the Letters or Syllables of the Name Jeſus. For, theſe Schoolmen hold *Images* and thoſe *other* things capable of the worſhip of the Exemplar only in the ſame manner: If Images of our Lord capable of *Latria*, ſo the reſt: See *Vaſquez*, *Ibid. Diſp.* 108. *c.* 11. The Title of which Chapter is, *—Eodem modo, atque Imagines, Nomen* Jeſus, *& alias res ſacras* [he names *Crucem, vaſa ſacra, librum Evangeliorum* &c.] *eſſe adorandas.* And ſee *Suarez Diſp.* 54. §. 6. And *Lugo*, *De Incarnat. Diſp.* 36. §. 5. ſaying the ſame. When *Bellarmin* ſpeaks of giving to our Lord before an Image the *cultus Latriæ*, *De Imag.* 2. *l. c.* 23. he ſaith the Image here is neither *ſuppoſitum quod adoratur*, nor *ratio adorationis*, *ſed quiddam adjunctum*, and ſhares no more of this Honor, than the Kings garments do of that we give the King; and he ſaith, that ſuch Worſhip is applied to the Image only *improprie & per accidens*, *De Imag.* 2. *l.* 21. *c.* and then again, to bring off this expreſſion, he ſaith, *—Quod non dicitur niſi improprie, ſimpliciter poteſt negari.* And, for his Simile, may not one truly ſay, that in the honor given by him to the Royal Majeſty ſitting in his Robes, the Robes have no ſhare at all? *Vaſquez*, as we have ſeen, before §. 37. allows to the Image only an *external* Note of Honor, but no *internal* Cult at all, proper, or improper, ſupreme or inferior; *i. e.* (ſay others) allows them no honor, or adoration at all, which they ſay cannot be done in any manner by external geſtures only, without any internal intention. But then, when they ſpeak of an in-

internal reſpect or honor given to the Image, as the proper object of ſuch reſpect for the Exemplar's ſake, not only any *latria*, but any *ſubmiſſio animi tanquam excellentiori* is herein diſclaimed: of which ſaith *Lugo, non poteſt eſſe rationalis controverſia.*

Laſtly; the worſt that can be of ſuch learned men, who, by their aſcending to ſubtilties, have the infelicity alſo to be miſunderſtood, yet, where is had ſo plain a Definition and explication of the Church [*Non latriam*], it ſeems unjuſt, againſt this, to make uſe of ſome contradictions and inconſiſtencies (were there any ſuch) of ſome private Authors. To them we may ſay, as long ago Cardinal *Bellarmin*, *De Imag. 2. l. 22. c.* —*Cur, quæſo, non loquimur, ut Patres noſtri loquuntur?* And, if it be lawful to deſert not only the expreſſions, but opinion of St. *Thomas* in other points, why not in this? Nor, from ſuch expreſſions, can any have the leaſt pretence either to accuſe the Roman Church of Idolatry, or reject its Communion. This, of ſome School-Expreſſions. And this in 4*th* place from §. 16. of the Roman Church's not acknowledging any either *Latria*, or *Dulia* to Images. §. 39.

5*ly*, Neither doth ſhe give to them any external ſign of honor, which the Divine Majeſty hath appropriated to his own ſervice and worſhip. They ſacrifice not to them, as all former both Heathen and Jewiſh Idolatry did. And, as for any other ſigns of reſpect given them, they have bin already cleared before §. 31, 32. §. 40.

6. Laſtly; To clear the Roman Church from any ſuch Doctrine or Practice about Images, as renders her Cult of them Idolatry, an Idolatry equal with the Heathen, we may urge Mr. *Thorndike*'s Argument ſet down below, §. 48. For that ſo ſhe can be no true Church, neither the whole, nor any true part of the Church Catholick (which, if it cannot maintain any Hereſy, can much leſs Idolatry. See *Annotation* on Dr. *Stillingfl. p.* 73. *l.* 13.) Yet Proteſtants do not deny the Roman to be a true Church. And, ſhould they, they would deſtroy a legal Miſſion or Ordination of their own Church-Miniſtry or Clergy received from this Church. §. 41.

IV. §. 42. IV. The third Head propoſed being thus diſpatched, What Cult or Worſhip, practiſed by all former Idolaters, Catholicks do *deny* to Images; I come next to ſhew you, what they *allow*.

1. Firſt then, they maintain a very beneficial uſe of the Images of our Lord or his Saints ſet before us when we pray; and eſpecially, when ſubject to diſtraction of thoughts in Prayer, that the ſight thereof may ſerve to heighten our devotion, and the better confine our meditation on the Perſon, or ſacred Story repreſented, and hinder our Imaginations from ſtraying abroad; may ſerve to excite in us acts of Honor, Love, Affection to ſuch Perſons, a grateful remembrance and imitation of them, of their Heroick Vertues, and valiant Sufferings, a paſſionate repreſenting to them (the Perſons I mean, nor the Pictures) our preſent condition, and imploring their aid and interceſſions *&c.* From the more frequent practice of which acts, occaſioned by theſe ſenſible memorials of our Bleſſed Lord, and his Saints, Catholicks experience ſo great an advantage in raiſing their affections, as that they are not eaſily by the groundleſs clamours of Idolatry (or of the peril thereof to Chriſtians, wherein Heathens are made ſo ſubtile) to be frighted out of them: Nor the Church moved at all to reſtrain the good uſe that is made of, and fruit received by, them.

§. 43. 2*ly*, Catholicks do maintain a certain honor, reverence, or veneration properly due and lawful to be given to the Images or Pictures of our Lord or his Saints, and that *per*, *in*, or *ſecundum*, *ſe*, to the Image in it ſelf, and as the proper object of ſuch Honor or Veneration.

§. 44. n. 1. 3. But 3*ly* this only a relative honor and not given *propter ſe*; but ſuch, whereby, out of the love and honor we owe to the Prototype, we have an affection alſo to thoſe things that any way appertain to it, to any Relick, Repreſentation, Memorial of it. To underſtand which (if it needs any further explaining) we may obſerve with *Suarez*, In 3. *Thom.* q. 25. *Diſp.* 54. §. 4, 5. That to, or in the preſence of, an Image

Image a twofold Adoration may be performed. 1. Either an Adoration both internal and external (the external still following the intention of the mind) only to the Exemplar, and none at all to the Image (the Image or Picture serving only as a Motive thereto, or a Remembrancer thereof) of which we have spoken before, §. 36. 2. Or an internal and external Adoration, such as that we here speak of, directed only to the Image (not the Exemplar) as its proper object; tho the honor we owe to the Exemplar be the sole motive thereof: so that, if it be done to an Image of our Lord, it proceeds originally from the honor we owe unto our Lord, tho it is not that Honor: Or also, one and the same external gesture subservient to a double internal intention; one, directed to the Figure; the other, to the thing designed by it. Now both these Worships are by the Church maintained lawful, and this later in the second *Nicene* Council vindicated, against those who, tho they were no Iconoclasts, but allowing the use of Images, yet denied it lawful to pray, or bow before, to kiss, or embrace, or to use lights, perfumes, or shew any other signs of honor to, them (therefore these called by *Epiphanius*, 2. *Conc. Nic. Act.* 6. *in fin.* ἡμιφαύλοι, and ψευδαλήθεις *semi-pravi*, and *falso veri*) whenas yet those very persons that denied these lawful to Images, performed the like Ceremonies to the Cross, the Book of the Gospels, and other sacred Utensils. Against these therefore it concerned the Church to vindicate such long-practiced Salutation, or honorary Adoration of Images. Which also was defended in that Council, by the like civil Honors and Ceremonies relating to the Exemplar by Christians without scruple performed to the Emperors waxen Effigies or Statues; brought into Cities for their doing homage, where the Emperor could not appear, and receive it in person. ---*Si enim* (saith a Bishop there, 2. *Conc. Nic. Act.* 1.) *Regum laureata & Iconas missas ad civitates vel regiones obvii adeunt populi cum Cereis & Incensis, non cera perfusam tabulam, sed Imperatorem honorantes; Quanto magis oportet in Ecclesiis* &c. And *Act* 2. *Epist. Adriani ad Imperat.* such like words are quoted out of St. *Chrysostome, Serm. in* 5. *fer. Paschæ.* ---*Neque enim quando Imperiales vultus & Imagines in civitates introducuntur & obviant Judices &*

plebes cum laudibus tabulam honorant, vel ſupereffuſam cera ſcripturam [or *ſculpturam*] *ſed figuram Imperatoris:* To which I may add, that of *Athanaſius, Contra Arrianos Serm.* 4. mentioned before, —*Qui adorat imaginem Regis in illa adorat ipſum Regem: quippe cum ipſa Imago nihil aliud ſit quam Regis forma ac ſpecies:* and alſo the civil honors, that are, in relation to the Prince, tho in his abſence, given in the Chamber of Preſence, and, to the Chair of State. And, ſee in *Nazianzen*, in *Julian. Orat.* 1. the advantage *Julian* thought to make of ſuch Honor given to Princes for an artificial inducement of Chriſtians to commit Idolatry by repreſenting ſome of his Heathen Gods in the ſame table with the Emperor, that ſo they might either worſhip both, and ſo paſs for Idolaters; or neither, and ſo ſuffer for diſloyalty. And the heavy puniſhment inflicted, and greater threatned by *Theodoſius* the Emperor to the Citizens of *Antioch* for their caſting down the Empreſſe's Statue there, is well known (of which St. *Ambroſe*, in *Pſal.* 118. *Serm.* 10. —*Qui ſtatuam contempſerit Imperatoris, Imperatori utique feciſſe videtur injuriam, & qui imaginem Imperatoris coronat, illum honorat, cujus imaginem coronavit.*) And, if, to ſhew their hate to a perſon, people do, as it were naturally, abuſe their ſtatues; and Magiſtrates that cannot reach the Perſons, do execution on great Delinquents *in effigie, vnco impacto ad latrinas, ad Gemonias*, it is as natural for thoſe who love the perſon, to honor them.

§. 44. n. 2. 4*ly*, Catholicks affirm, that there is no prohibition in any part of the firſt (or call it, if you pleaſe the ſecond) Commandment of either of theſe two, 1. the making and uſe; or 2. ſuch veneration, as is here aſſerted, of the Images of our Lord and his Saints. The words are theſe, *Non habebis Deos alienos coram me. Non facies tibi ſculptile, neque omnem ſimilitudinem, quæ eſt in cœlo deſuper, & quæ in terra deorſum* &c. *Non adorabis ea, neque coles. Ego ſum Dominus Deus tuus, fortis, zelotes.* Where being prohibited in the firſt part to have (or, if you will, to worſhip) any God ſave the true, we are conſequently much more prohibited to have to ſuch an end, or to worſhip, any ſimilitude or Image of them; the wor-

worſhip of which is ſtill for the ſake of that it repreſents: and therefore St. *Auſtine*, *Quæſt. in Exod.* 71. concludes all but one precept, the later part explaining the former. ---*Non erunt tibi Dii alii præter me: Hoc ipſum* (ſaith he) *perfectius explicatur, cum prohibentur colenda figmenta.* And, ---*Quo pertinet, non facies tibi Idolum, niſi ad id quod dictum eſt, non erunt tibi Dii alii præter me.* Now theſe words *Non adorabis ea, neque coles*, or *ſervies*, cannot be underſtood of any veneration or reverence whatever given to any Image whatever (as ſome do enlarge it) for many reaſons.

1. Becauſe there will ſeem the ſame reaſon of extracting, from the *Non facies tibi* in the Text, the not making or having any ſuch Images, in any ſenſe, or to any end, whatever. But the making and uſe of them Proteſtants allow; and the Jews, under the Law, practiſed: *Solomon* making many figures in the Temple, for which he had no command; and God himſelf alſo, after he had given them this Precept, commanded ſeveral Images or Similitudes to be made, as the Cherubims joined to the Ark (to which *Solomon* added two more much larger before it) and afterward the Brazen Serpent, an eminent Type of the Crucifix; tho this foreſeen, that it would afterward be abuſed to Idolatry. Which command ſhews, that if any making of Images was prohibited to the Jews (as ſome Catholicks affirm) yet, that thus far this Precept is not to be accounted Natural, or Moral, but only Ceremonial (as thoſe Catholicks alſo limit it) may be gathered from the Divine Diſpenſation therewith, in ſome particular counter-commands for the making them, ſo ſoon after he had given it. Of this matter thus Mr. *Thorndike*, *Juſt Weights*, *c.* 19. *p.* 126. 'It is far more reaſonable to ſay, 'That the Cherubims, the brazen Serpent, the Bulls, and 'other Images in *Solomon*'s Temple, were no breaches of it, 'than to ſay, That God did diſpenſe with his own Precept 'in thoſe caſes, having no appearance of any diſpenſation 'in the Scripture, in which the Precept and the ſeeming 'breach are both recorded. But it is manifeſt, that the Jews 'allow ſome kind of Imagery. And it is manifeſt, that the 'publick Authority of that Nation, or Religion, could never 'diſpenſe in that which God's Law had prohibited.

2*ly*, Be-

§. 45. 2*dly*, Becauſe the worſhiping or ſerving in this Precept, which God challengeth only to himſelf, and becomes jealous, as he ſaith, if communicated to any others, muſt be extended to other things beſides Images and the likeneſſes of things, even to all the Creatures themſelves: To the Hoſt of Heaven (See *Deut.* 4. 14. 19. where this Precept being delivered more at large theſe are joined with the *Sculptiles.*) To any ſacred things alſo, to *Gideon*'s Ephod, to the Egyptians living Ox; to the Emperors and Potentates of the Earth; the Deifying of whom was a great part of ancient Idolatry; and rather to thoſe things the more, which, among the Creatures, are the more dignified, and ſo may ſooner provoke the Lord to jealouſy, and which things indeed are the principal object of all ſuch worſhip, and the likeneſs of them honoured only at the ſecond hand for their ſake. This then ſuppoſed, both theſe ſeem very unreaſonable; either to ſay, this Precept forbids any worſhip whatever to be given to any Creature: or that it forbids only a *Latria*, the giving ſupreme or divine Worſhip to any *other* thing, but indeed prohibites meanwhile the giving *any* Worſhip at all whatever to *Images*: Eſpecially, when the temptation to Idolotry is more dangerous, where the object thereof is more excellent; and when neither the practice of the Heathen, nor Jewiſh, Idolatry was ſo only addicted to Images, but that it extended to other Creatures; and thoſe that were amongſt theſe the more glorious; (therefore alſo was the place of the Body of *Moſes* deceaſed concealed from the Iſraelites:) and, again, when the ſelf ſame Worſhip or Veneration (*i. e.* for the relation things have to another thing that is honoured by us) which, if given to Images, is ſaid to break this Precept, yet is allowed to be ſafely given to other holy things, upon ſuch relation, without any violation of this Precept. For, I ſuppoſe, thoſe who make any Veneration of *Images* a breach of this Law, do not ſo any veneration or reverence given to *ſacred* things. Or, if they do, the *Adorate ſcabellum Pſal.* 98. and *Moſes*'s putting off his ſhooe becauſe the ground was holy, *Exod.* 3. 5. *Joſ.* 5. 15. *Gen.* 28. 16, 17, 18. do warrant the contrary. And *venerabantur quondam Judæi Sancta Sanctorum* (ſaith St. *Jerome*, *Epiſt.* 17. *Ad Marcellam.*) from which he inferrs,

Nonne

Nonne tibi venerabilius videtur Sepulchrum Domini? Yet was the Ark alſo, as well as the Images of the Cherubims, liable to be adored with ſuch a kind of Worſhip, as might be ſtat Idolatry.

It is moſt true then, and willingly conceded to thoſe who, I know not to what end, do preſs it, that if God *declares*, that any worſhip whatever given to an Image is *Idolatry*, no diſtinction about worſhip can ſave us from it; but, as you ſee, moſt reaſonably ſtill maintained, that God in this Precept, or elſewhere in the Scriptures, hath *declared* no ſuch thing. And, were the ſenſe of Scriptures here diſputable, yet from whom ought we to learn it rather, than from the Church; which we have ſhewed in her ſupreme Councils to expound them otherwiſe? Laſtly, ſuppoſing all Veneration of Images prohibited in the ſecond Commandment, yet if the Veneration practiſed againſt the Precept be ſuch only, as is lawfully given to other Creatures, as to ſacred things, the miſapplication thereof to Images will be a fault, or a ſin, becauſe tranſgreſſing ſome part of God's Law: but not therefore the ſin of Idolatry; becauſe no honor is done to it, but what may be lawfully done to the Creatures, and thoſe, as to their ſubſtance, the meaneſt; and ſo no Divine Jealouſy raiſed thereby.

Meanwhile ſome Catholick Divines alſo, I grant there are, that hold by this Commandment any Worſhip whatever, little, or great, to be prohibited to Images. But then ſo do they 1*ſt*, the making or uſe of any Images. 2*ly*, thus far they reſtrain and contract this Precept to be a ceremonial and temporal one, belonging only to the Jews, a Nation, and in an Age, much inclined to Idolatry: 3*ly*, grant this Precept not prohibiting the Jews the Adoration of other things ſacred, the Temple, the Ark, *&c.* from which they collect, that the prohibition therein ſolely of Image-worſhip hath nothing of Morality in it: by all which their opinion is rendred uſeleſs to Proteſtants, who urge it. 4*ly*, They labour here under ſeveral difficulties: as not only God's commanding the Images of the Cherubims, and afterward of a Serpent, to be made, but *Solomon*'s voluntary framing ſeveral figures, as without command, ſo without treſpaſſing any: and their anſwers to them

§. 46.

them ſeem to ſome other Catholicks not ſatisfactory.

This concerning no prohibition in the *firſt* or *ſecond* Commandment either of the making, or of the Veneration of Images, ſuch as is maintained by Catholicks, *viz.* only a relative honor, and though given *per*, *in*, or *ſecundum ſe* to the Image, yet not *propter ſe*; but ſuch, whereby, out of the love and honor we owe to the Prototype, we have an affection and reſpect alſo to thoſe things that any way appertain to it.

§. 47. *5ly*, But, then, this reſpect or eſteem of it is not affirmed the very ſame that we exhibit to the Prototype it ſelf; nor any ſuch honor, as implies our *ſubmiſſion* to it; or it a thing held more *excellent*, than our ſelves. No inanimate thing being, in reaſon, capable of ſuch a ſubjection and homage from Man; or an inferior from the ſuperior. But ſuch an inferior reverence and reſpect, as is given to other relatives and appertinents of Holy Perſons, or Inſtruments of Religion: Such as is given *Typo venerandæ Crucis, & Sanctis Evangeliis, & reliquis Sacris*, as the Second *Nicene* Council (referred-to by that of *Trent*) declare their meaning; and ſo again the 8*th* General Council *cap.* 3. recited before, §. 20, *&c.* Such as is given to the Holy Croſs, to the Book of Holy Scriptures, to the Sacred Utenſils, Churches, Altars, laſtly to the Holy Name of JESUS: for, as I have ſhewed, both the Councils and Schoolmen do compare and equal all theſe; and defend that of Images by the other, as to the ſame kind of honor, cult, or reverence given them: tho this reverence may be gradually different, as the Perſon repreſented is more excellent; or the thing, ſo honoured for his ſake, more nearly relating to him.

Of theſe thus *Bellarmin*, *De Imag.* l. 2. c. 21. *Non debetur Imagini Honor qui debetur Deo, ſed minor. Non aſſerimus eundem honorem, ſed aliquem honorem deberi Imagini.* Again, Ibid. *c.* 19. *Imago cum ſit res inanimata, & ſenſus ac rationis expers, non eſt honoris capax propter ſe: & ideo Imagines non honorantur abſolute, ſed relative ad Prototypum. Qui honor tranſit ad Exemplar mediate & quaſi conſequenter: nam qui honorat imaginem alicujus ſine dubio honorat propter eum cujus eſt Imago*, Ibid. *c.* 21. And *Imagines venerandæ eo modo quo veneramur Evangelia, & ſacra vaſa.* 6*ly*, A

6*ly*, A Veneration or Reverence due to *Holy things* as the ancient Oppoſers of *Nice* did, ſo the ſoberer ſort of Proteſtants do willingly, acknowledge. §. 48.

To *Bellarmin*, urging, That *Judæi ſolebant, proſtrati ad terram, venerari imagines Cherubim*, Biſhop *Andrews* anſwers, *Reſp. ad Apol.* c. 8. p. 204. *At Cherubim* &c. *non adorarunt. Nam veneratos eſſe eos Sanctum Sanctorum non dubitamus, qui & ipſi Templa veneramur: Sed ad Adorationem nimis anguſta venerandi vox.* And Cap. 1. p. 35. *Rex adorationem Reliquiarum reprehendit, non Venerationem.* And p. 50. *Tandem autem eo forte recidet ut non alium eis honorem congruere dicturus ſit, quam libro Evangelii vel vaſis Sacramentorum: De quo neque nos habebit valde repugnantes.* Thus He. But, if that Veneration of the Images of the Cherubim be allowed, which he yields of the Temple, no more is by *Bellarmin* or Catholicks deſired. But, then, for the term Adoration or Incurvation: the Scripture uſeth this term for *Scabellum pedum* twice, and for *Templum*, and *Montem Sanctum* too; See *Pſal.* 98. 5. *Adorate Scabellum*: And *ver.* 9. and *Pſal.* 131. 7. and *Pſal.* 5. 8. Or, if in all theſe by reaſon of a Prefix ל before the word, they are to be tranſlated *ad Scabellum, ad Templum, incurvate vos Templo*, or *ad Templum*, yet the Scripture uſeth the ſame mode of expreſſion for *Abraham*'s worſhiping of the Sons of *Heth*, and *Jacob* of *Pharaoh* (where is the ſame Article ל too, and as much reaſon for tranſlating *ad filios Heth*, as *ad Scabellum*, or *ad Templum:*) I ſay in theſe the word *Adorare* is uſed and applied to them notwithſtanding *Non* added in the ſecond Commandment to the very ſame Hebrew word, that is uſed in the other, *Exod.* 20. *Non adorabis ea, neque coles*, that is, *non adorabis*, neither any thing, nor the Image or Similitude of any thing, Sun, Moon, or Stars, in Heaven or in Earth. This *Abraham adoravit filios Heth* muſt force the Biſhop not to reſtrain the word always to the Supreme, or Divine Worſhip. And then, *Adorare* being taken ſometimes for *venerari* as it runs *adoravit filios Heth*, ſo it may alſo *adorate Scabellum, & Templum*, without an *Ad*; and he may ſafely ſay, if *Templa veneramur*, ſo *Templa adoramus*; both ſignifying the ſame inferior worſhip or honor. But, however, Veneration of Temples, and other holy things, and, if I miſtake him not, of the Cherubims, Biſhop *An-*

dreæs allows. Thus he alſo elſewhere, *Serm. on Phil.* 2. 10. *p.* 478. of the Reverence due to the Holy Name of JESUS. 'He is exalted '(ſaith he) to whoſe Perſon knees do bow; but, to whoſe Name 'only, much more. And, ---His Name he left behind to us, that we 'may ſhew, by our reverence and reſpect to it, how much we eſteem 'him; how true the Pſalm ſhall be, *Holy and reverend is his Name.* 'Look to the Text then; and let no man perſwade you, but that 'God requireth a reverent carriage, even of the Body it ſelf: 'And namely, this ſervice of the Knee; And that, to his Son's 'Name. Do it to the ſenſe; have mind on him that is named, [there is the relative honor of it] and do his Name the honor, and 'ſpare not. The ſame he ſaith there alſo of the Holy Myſteries 'in the Euchariſt. There are (ſaith he, wondring at it) that 'forbear to do it at his Name: Nay at the Holy Myſteries them-'ſelves: Where his Name is (I am ſure) and more than his Name, 'even the Body and Blood of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. Thus He.

Again: Biſhop *White* againſt *Fiſher*, *p.* 224. ſaith, ---'Religious 'Adoration may be founded on ſome certain kinds of Union, '1. Perſonal, 2 Subſtantial, or 3 laſtly Cauſal, relative, or acci-'dental; to wit, when by divine ordination things created are 'made inſtruments, meſſengers, ſigns, or receptacles of divine 'grace, as the holy Sacraments, and the Word and Goſpel, and 'the Miniſters of the Church &c. Chriſt himſelf is preſent, 'aſſiſtant, and operative, in and by theſe inſtruments, and hath 'commanded reverence to be uſed towards them; accounting the 'love, faith, and honor which are yielded to his created Word, 'to be love, faith, and honor to himſelf. And before *p.* 219. Upon the relative union alſo between the King and his Image, ſhewed by *F. Fiſher* out of St. *Athanaſius*, *Contra Arrianos Serm.* 4. Upon which that Father there concludes; *Qui igitur adorat imaginem, in illa adorat ipſum Regem, quia cum ipſa imago nihil aliud ſit quam Regis forma ac ſpecies*, the Biſhop grants, ---'That the 'Images of Kings ſometimes (ſaith he) not always, in civil uſe, 'and cuſtome, not in Religion, may be taken, and reverenced for 'the principal. [I ſuppoſe then in civil uſe and cuſtome, not in religious, ſo may our Lord's Image too, ſometimes. And then, why not at any time, either his or the King's?] *De Sanctorum Reliquiis & Imaginibus* &c. (ſaith *Spalatenſis*, *Oſtenſio Errorum Suarez*, cap. 2.) *cultum in his diſtinguo, ac Venerationem: Humanum*

manum neque Rex, neque Orthodoxi negabunt; religiosum vero & divinum omnino negandum esse affirmo. And afterward distinguishing — *Excellentiam, qua a Deo fuerunt supernaturaliter exaltati, & solam civilem excellentiam in ipsis,* he saith, —*Honore eodem humano utramque excellentiam & divinam & humanam in homine prosequimur: Religioso autem, hoc est divino, honore solum Deum prosequendum esse arbitramur.* [and as well might he, if he pleased, have distinguished a Religious honor into *Humanus & Divinus.*] Bishop *Mountague*, in his *Appeal to Cæsar*, chap. 21. saith; 'That no Religious Honor or Worship is to be given to 'Images; but yet, —That all Reverence simply cannot be abstracted from them. 'And can a man (saith he there) have the 'true Representation of his Prince, Patrons, *&c.* without awe, 'respect, regard, love, reverence, moved by aspect, and wrought 'in him? I profess my imperfection, or what they will call it, it is so with me. And quotes this out of *Junius* in his Animadversions upon *Bellarmin, De Imaginibus*; —*Hoc nemo nostrum dicit, non esse colendas* [Imagines] *nec ullo modo.* Suo modo coli probamus, *velut Imagines*; *at non religioso cultu, qui aut superstitiosus est, aut impius. Nec cum aliorum scandalo, sive cultus separatus, sive conjunctus cum eorum cultu intelligatur, quorum sunt Imagines.* Bishop *White* also of Images themselves speaks thus in the beginning of his Discourse, *p.* 208. 'The Advocate of 'Imagery [*Fisher*] should first of all have declared, what he un-'derstands by Worship of Images, whether Veneration only, 'largely taken; or Adoration, properly so called. Veneration may signify external regard and reverence of Pictures, such as is given to Churches, and sacred Vessels, and to ornaments of sacred Places; and, according to this notion, many have approved or tolerated Worship of Images, which deny Adoration: And amongst the *many* here he means not only Papists but Protestants: For there he quotes also this place of *Junius* for it; and, before him, cites the Council of *Nice*, that we may see both agree. Some cult, honor, reverence we see then here allowed as to other holy things, so to Images. As for our stiling it a *religious* Cult we cannot hinder but that Protestants may take the word (of which see enough before, §. 16 *&c.*) as that Catholicks dare not apply it so to any thing save to God. Of the Equivocation that is in this, and many other words not easily to be avoided, Mr. *Thorndike*

ſaith well, *Epilog.* 3. *l.* 30. *c. p.* 353. where ſpeaking of the term of Religious as applied to the honor of Saints he ſaith; 'Whether this Honor be Religious, or Civil nothing but equivocation of words makes diſputable. And, —That all is to be imputed to nothing but want of proper terms for that Honor, which Religion enjoines in reſpect of God, and that relation which God hath ſetled between the Church Militant and Triumphant, being reaſonably called Religious. —And being neither civil nor humane honor, but ſuch as a Creature is capable of for Religion's ſake, and that relation which Religion ſetleth. Thus He. But that then, when otherwiſe agreed, we may not fall out about words, tho this honor is given to the Image not of a Statesman, but of an Holy Perſon, and to other things becauſe they are ſacred and belonging to Religion, yet rather than the propriety of two words ſhall ſeparate us, let them, ſo as allowing it, freely ſtile and call it, if they pleaſe, a *civil* Veneration of the Name of JESUS, and of the Euchariſtical Myſteries, of the Images of our Lord, and his Mother, of the Apoſtles, Martyrs, and other Saints. For indeed we are all ſpiritual Fellow-citizens, *Phil.* 3. 20. and our Religion a celeſtial πολίτευμα or Common-wealth, and our Lord the Head of it, *Heb.* 12. 22, 23.

Again, thus Mr. *Thorndike*, *Juſt Weights*, *c.* 19. *p.* 128. (according to his free language in free times.) —'The Furniture and Utenſils of the Church were honoured in the ſpotleſs times of the Church, as conſecrated to God's ſervice; tho the honor of them being uncapable of honor for themſelves, was manifeſtly, and without any ſcruple, the honor of God. But Images, ſo long as they were uſed to no further intent, than the ornament of Churches, the remembrance of holy Hiſtories, and the raiſing of Devotion thereby (as at the firſt they were uſed by the Church) [and ſo are ſtill] came in the number [I add; and ſo ought to receive the honor] of things conſecrated to God's Service.

Laſtly, thus *Daille Traicte des Images. c.* 7. in his Anſwer to St. *Gregory*'s forementioned Expreſſion [*ea qua dignum eſt veneratione*] ſeems to allow ſome Veneration to ſuch things, ſo it be not *cult, ou ſervice religieuſe*. 'A certain degree of reſpect and honor (ſaith he) is due to all the Inſtruments of Religion: as to the perſons and things of the Church, to the Prieſts, to the Chalices,

'to

'to the ſacred Bibles, which every one calls venerable, yet none 'deferrs to them the religious ſervice which thoſe of the Roman 'Communion now adays render to Images. See alſo *Ibid. p.* 340. 376. And *Apol. des Egliſ. Reform. c.* 10. One of his Anſwers to the Text *Adorate Scabellum* (*Pſal.* 98.) is; ---That this Adora-'tion of the Ark was an inferior ſpecies of honor to the Adora-'tion of *Latria*, which is due to none but God. Thus He. This inferior reverence then due to holy things let him allow to the Images of our Lord and his Saints, and, for any further *latria* or religious ſervice, he ſhall be diſpenſed with. And here I may conclude with what a modern Controvertiſt (*Spencer, Scripture miſtaken. p.* 128.) writ not long ſince in debating the ſence of the Second Commandment, 'That what Worſhip ſoever 'a well-minded Proteſtant ſhould judge may be given to the Holy 'Name of JESUS, when he ſees it either printed in a Book, or 'engraven in a Stone, without all Superſtition, or Idolatry, or 'breach of the Second Commandment [I add, or what the Jews 'might give to the Ark,] let him give the ſame to any Image of 'our Saviour, and in the ſame manner, or at leaſt judge that the 'like may lawfully be given to it, and no more in this point will 'be required of him to be eſteemed conformable to the Doctrine, 'and Practice of the Roman Church.

To the Teſtimonies of Proteſtants confeſſing a certain Reverence and Honor due to Holy things might be added the Teſtimonies of the Fathers, and conſtant Practice of the Church in all former times, and the ſeveral commands and examples thereof occurring in the Scripture, *Ye ſhall reverence my Sanctuary*, Lev. 19. 30. and 26. 2. And *Adorate Scabellum pedum ejus*, and that, *quia ſanctum eſt*, ſince both in the Hebrew are of the ſame Gender, *Sanctum* or *Sanctus* may relate either to *Scabellum*, or *Dominus*; and the place where it was was called *Sanctum Sanctorum*: Such things, I ſay, I might collect if I thought this were a thing that would be much queſtioned, ſave by ſome late profane Sects, that cry down alſo all Things and Perſons ſacred, the Clergy, and Churches.

7. Next: If it be more particularly enquired, what this Veneration or Honor is, that is communicable, or pretended to belong, as to other holy things, ſo to holy Images, (for ſo I call §. 49.

I call thoſe repreſenting Holy Perſons), Such Honors, for the external ſigns thereof, have uſed to be in ancient times, and ſtill are in the Roman, as alſo Oriental, Churches, uncovering the head, bowing, kiſſing, embracing, lights, perfumes, &c. As we ſee alſo, men place in their Cloſet, kiſs, or embrace, the Picture or Effigies of a perſon whom they dearly love, without any fear of either *Idololatria*, or *Idolodulia* in ſuch a Practice. Again, For the internal intention joined with ſuch outward geſtures, this alſo *non ullus cultus eorum qui tribuuntur naturæ intelligenti*, as *Bellarmin* obſerves; or any ſuch ſubmiſſion of mind, as he that honors it acknowledges himſelf inferior to it; which *Vaſquez* therefore (taking internal Adoration in ſo ſtrict ſenſe) juſtly rejects as unapplicable to any Image, or inanimate thing in what conſideration ſoever; but an inward eſteem and value of them for ſome particular relation they have to ſome other object more excellent than our ſelves; as alſo an intention by the outward geſtures we uſe to ſhew, not to the Image to which we perform them, but to any perſons capable of underſtanding our action, the Prototype, or others, the eſteem we have of any thing ſo nearly belonging to ſuch a perſon.

F. Suarez thus expreſſes it, In 3. *Thom. Diſp.* 54. §. 5. *Eſt Exiſtimatio quædam Imaginis ---ut eſt ſimilitudo ad perſonam ſacram*, or *---ut eſt quædam res habens relationem ad tale exemplar*; *Propter quam honor illi exhibetur non ea intentione, ut Ipſa illum percipiat* [ſuch cult belongs only to things intelligent] *ſed ſolum ut convenienti & reverenti modo tractetur, juxta exiſtimationem, quæ de illa haberi debet*; *atque adeo ut hæc ipſa exiſtimatio ipſismet actionibus ſignificetur & oſtendatur: Significatio autem hæc, ſicut non fit propter Imaginem quæ adoratur, ita neque fit ad ipſam, id eſt, ut ipſa percipiat animum & intentionem adorantis*; *ſed, hoc modo, ordinatur ſignificatio ad eum, propter quem fit adoratio, vel certe etiam ad alios, qui adorationem vident* [whereby ſuch perſon would teſtify to them his honor of the Prototype.] *Unde per tale officium adorationis homo non ita ſe ſubmittit Imagini, ut profiteatur ſe inferiorem illa* [which may remove *Vaſquez*'s ſcruple] *ſed ſolum profitetur Imaginem pertinere, ſeu eſſe aliquid ejus, qui ſuperior & excellentior eſt.* In which worſhip of the Image *virtualiter exhibetur*

betur rei intellectuali debitus cultus, quamvis in expreſſa & formali intentione hoc non habeatur. Thus *Suarez, De Myſterio Incarnat. Diſp.* 36. §. 3. *n.* 39. And *Lugo* thus ---*Animus exercendi exterius circa Imaginem* (*dando ei ſuperiorem locum, honorifice eam tractando* &c.) *propter excellentiam Exemplaris, quam repræſentat, eas actiones ſubmiſſionis externæ præſtat, quas exercere ſolemus circa excellentiores & dominos* (*ſed non quod volumus ſignificare, quod interius exiſtimemus Imaginem eſſe nobis ſuperiorem vel dominum*) *quia totus hic honor debetur Exemplari etiam in ſua Imagine.* This I have exhibited at length out of theſe two judicious Schoolmen, to avoid many cavils about the mode of this inferior worſhip and obſervance that is given to, and terminated in, Images; as alſo, in other ſacred things.

8. Yet 8*ly* Catholicks contend; That it doth not hence become neceſſary, that this Exiſtimation or external reverent Tractation of inanimate things, performed to them in conſideration of ſome other ſacred or honourable perſon they appertain to, ſhould therefore be the ſame or equal, of all things that have any manner of Relation to ſuch Perſon; or, that the eſtimation of many ſuch things, circumſtances conſidered, ſhould be accompanied with any ſuch external note of reſpect or honor. So a Prince's Servant, a perſon much reſembling him, a Kinſman, a Friend, or Favourite, an Embaſſador, his Chair of State, his Robes, may all receive honor from us for the Prince's ſake, yet not all an equal to that we give the Prince; or one of them, to that we give to ſome other; or all on the ſelf ſame, but on a very different, account. And again, ſome other things of a leſs valued relation to him receive no external mark of eſteem at all; or, not in ſo ſpecial a manner, as the former. The ſame caſe it is in ſeveral things as they relate to God, (which, on many accounts, the whole Creation doth.) 1. Firſt God, here, may be worſhiped both with internal and external ſupreme Adoration, bowing, kneeling, proſtration &c. in the beholding and contemplating, and ſo in the preſence, of any of his Creatures, a Man, the Sun, the Stars, or any other whatever: I ſee not how any rational man can deny it. Yet exteriorly to do this in the ſight of others, who may miſinterpret our intentions, and miſtake- §. 10.

miſtake the direction of our Worſhip, eſpecially when the thing is of a greater eſſential or ſubſtantial dignity before, or toward, which we perform it; and which may be to us the occaſion of it, it is not *convenient*. And the ſame caſe it may poſſibly be in giving ſuch Adoration before a Picture or other ſacred thing in a Country wholly given to Idolatry; and in whom the light of Reaſon is ſo far extinguiſhed, as that they worſhip Pictures for Gods. The ſame caſe I ſay, in the incurring a fault, not of Idolatry, but of Indiſcretion. And perhaps this may be the reaſon of the rarer uſe of Pictures in the firſt four Ages of the Church, when the Chriſtian world was not as yet ſo well cleanſed from Heatheniſme; not that the uſe of theſe was not then held lawful, or alſo beneficial; but, that, for other conſiderations, not ſo expedient. 2*ly*. We may alſo retain a certain eſteem and value of the loweſt of God's Creatures, that is terminated in it; but for the Maker's ſake; of a Fly, an Ant *&c*, much more of the Sun. But here alſo we ſtand obliged to the obſerving a decency; and not giving a ſcandal in any our external expreſſions thereof, which are fitly reſerved for other much more principal or ſpecial *Relatives*. 3*ly*, Other things therefore there are of a more ſpecial relation and connexion to the prime Object of Honour and Adoration, as conſecrated to God's more immediate ſervice, or ſome way repreſenting or minding us of his preſence: Such are Churches, Altars, the conſecrated Symbols of the Euchariſt, the ſacred Utenſils and Chalices, Holy Relicks, Holy Croſs, the Holy Name of JESUS, and in the laſt place, ſacred Images or Pictures; which I call ſacred, tho ſome of them be not conſecrated, if they be ſuch as repreſent and carry a ſimilitude of Sacred Perſons, *viz.* of our Lord, or his Saints; the natural property of which copies, being to bring into our mind and renew in us, the remembrance of their Originals that are ſacred, gives us a ſufficient title to ſtile them ſo too; and the Church, having found a ſingular benefit in ſuch an effect of them, hath frequently dedicated, conſecrated and expoſed, ſeveral of them in her publick places of worſhip for the ſame uſe; which adds alſo a further degree of Reverence to thoſe ſo dedicated.

Now,

Now, what thoſe things punctually are, which are to be treated with ſuch a ſpecial reverence or eſteem as due to them on the former account, this ſurely ought to be left to the judgment and arbitration of the Church, and of our Canonical Superiors, whoſe office it is to weigh the con- or inconveniences, the decency or indecency thereof; and private perſons may ſafely act herein according to her declarations and directions. Neither, ſuch external reverenc being ſo required, may we withdraw it for fear of ſcandal, as in the former but now mentioned, but we are to correſpond to the Church's Conſtitutions in our obedience; and thoſe who take ſcandal are to endeavour to rectify their own fault, not ours, in conforming themſelves alſo to the ſame judgment; always remembring that paſſage of St. *Auſtine*, Epiſt. 118. ---*Si quid tota per orbem frequentat Eccleſia, quin ita faciendum ſit diſputare inſolentiſſimæ inſaniæ eſt.* If Images then, repreſenting holy Perſons and Stories, are numbred and ranked among theſe things venerable, by the Church, *i. e.* by the moſt ſupreme authority of its Councils; and the veneration of them there reſolved (as hath bin ſhewed §. 12. *&c.*) we need no more thus bandy arguments *pro* and *con*, but ſecurely reſt in an humble obedience, and leave the care of preventing or remedying miſtakes, and the conſidering of the juſt extent of the Second Commandment and other Scriptures, to the ſame Authority.

§. 51. Meanwhile, thoſe Proteſtants, who allow a certain Reverence, ſignified by ſome exterior note thereof, due at leaſt to ſome ſacred things (for, I account, no genuine Sons of the Church of *England* do to all deny it) as to Churches (nicknamed by ſome others Steeple-houſes) to Altars, to the Holy Name of JESUS, to the ſacred Symbols of our Lord's Body and Blood, tho they deny it to Images, are concerned, here, as much as Catholicks; 1. both to make a diſtinction between exhibiting ſuch reverence to theſe, and promiſcuouſly doing this to any Creature, becauſe that all things alſo ſome way relate to God: as, between the reverence given to God's Sanctuary, or to his Altars, and given to the Sun. *Lev.* 26. 2. And again, 2. to diſtinguiſh the reverence they give to theſe

from that ſuperior honor they give to thoſe for whoſe ſake they honor theſe; the reverence they give to God's Sanctuary, from that they give to God himſelf. Neither may they produce here any ſuch arguments as current againſt the Veneration of Images, which will confute their own practice as to Churches, Altars, the Holy Name of JESUS *&c.* as ſome very unconſiderately do; and as will further appear, if we take that which a late Writer hath ſaid concerning the reaſonableneſs of worſhiping the Sun rather than an Image, and apply it to worſhiping the Sun rather, than any other ſacred things, Churches, Altars, *&c.* ſuch as Proteſtants alſo ſhew Reverence to.

§. 52. For, thus one may plead in his own words *Rom. Idol. p.* 69. againſt a Proteſtant uncovering his head, or ſhewing any reverence to a Church, to the Altar, or to the Holy Name of JESUS: or againſt the *Gallican* Biſhops that oppoſed *Nice*, bowing to, and incenſing Churches, Altars, the Goſpel, the Holy Utenſils, the Croſs, *&c.*: or the ſame may be applied if you will againſt bowing to the King's Chair of State, or the Emperor's Image. 'It 'ſeems (as he goes on there) much more reaſonable for me to 'worſhip God by proſtrating my ſelf to the Sun, or any of the 'heavenly Bodies, nay to an Ant, or a Fly, than to a wooden Ta'ble, or to a Stone-building, or to the leaves of a Book, or a few 'letters put together in a word, or to two ſticks acroſs, or to a 'ſilver Chalice, or to a wooden Chair. For, in the other I ſee 'great evidences of the power, and wiſdom, and goodneſs of God, 'which may ſuggeſt venerable apprehenſions of God to my mind; 'whereas theſe can have nothing worthy admiration, unleſs it 'be the skill of the Artificer. And I cannot for my heart under'ſtand, why I may not as well, nay better, burn Incenſe and ſay 'my Prayers to the Sun, having an intention only to honor the 'true God by it, as to do both thoſe, burn Frankincenſe and ſay my Prayers, in a Church, or before the Altars, or a Croſs [I ſay here *before*, becauſe as Proteſtants going into a Church or before an Altar to pray, yet do not pray to the Church, or Altar; ſo neither do Catholicks to an Image. And, as Proteſtants do not burn Frankincenſe in a Church, that the Church or Altar may ſcent it; ſo neither Catholicks, that the Image.] I am ſure the Sun 'hath

'hath far more advantages than any artificial Table, or a curious 'Structure can have, the beauty and influence of it may enflame 'and warm ones devotion much more. If the danger be, that 'I am more like to take the Sun for God, than a Church, a Ta-'ble, or a Book; on that account, that which deserves most ho-'nour should have least given it, and that which deserves least 'should have most. Then,

After his own reasoning ended, Thus he may set the Heathen himself upon the Protestant; as he there doth, upon the Catholick. 'I (saith the Heathen) proceeding only upon such princi-'ples as these, that there is one supreme infinite Being who makes 'use of some more illustrious Beings of the world to communicate 'benefits to the rest, on which account I think my self bound to 'testify the honor I owe to the supreme Deity by paying my due 'respects and honor also in subordination to him, to those sub-'servient and ministerial instruments of his, am not afraid of 'what any Prelatist in the world can say for my confutation. 'Nay I am tempted to laugh at their folly, and despise their weak-'ness, who plead for the Worship of God in, or before, a dull 'and rude heap of stones, or frame of wood, and condemn me for 'honouring God in the Sun the most noble part of the Creation. 'If they tell me, that the *supreme God must have a Worship proper 'to himself.* Yes, I answer them in their own terms, I by no 'means question it, and that is it, which is called [by them, and 'the Fathers, See St. *Austine, De Civ. Dei,* l. 10. c. 1.] λατρεία, 'which is reserved to the supreme Deity, all that I give to the 'Sun is but δυλεία, which deserves an ὑπερδυλεία because of its 'eminent usefulness. [But here the personated Heathen mi-stakes a litle: for, as the veneration of holy things is not by Pro-testants, so neither that of Images by Catholicks, called any δυλεία, see before §. 49. much less do Catholicks do the same things to an Image, which they do to God himself, as this Author tels his Reader a litle after.] 'If they say, *I make the Sun God by 'giving it religious worship:* no more, than they do Temples and 'Altars [for, the Catholick's Veneration given to Images is held no more *religious* in any sense, than that of Protestants to Chur-ches, Altars, the Holy Name of JESUS &c, words and things re-lating to Religion, not Civil commerce.] 'If they urge, that 'God hath forbidden worshiping the Host of Heaven, and so the Sun,

'Yes, that is, giving the Worſhip of the ſupreme God to them, 'but not a ſubordinate, relative, inferior, worſhip, which was all 'I intend; and I hope they are not ſo ignorant of the nature of 'humane actions, as not to know that they go whither they are 'tended; and my intent was only to honor the true God by it. It would be too tedious to proſecute the reſt of his Diſcourſe, juſtifying the worſhip of the Sun rather than of any other ſacred things againſt the Proteſtants as much, as, of it, rather than of Images, againſt Catholicks. And the ſame joint defence againſt ſuch Heathen may ſerve for them both: That ſuch relative reverence or veneration is not performed to thoſe things more, that are in their eſſence more noble, than others (for, what compariſon herein between the Sun and a Church?) Nor yet, to all things that have any relation to him, whom we principally and ſoveraignly honor (for, ſo have all God's Creatures whatever); but to thoſe only, that have a nearer and more immediate relation to him either by conſecration to his ſervice, as Churches Altars &c. or alſo a repreſentation of his Perſon (as the Images of our Lord,) or, ſome other way. In the reverent treatment of which things, tho theſe uncapable of any ſenſe thereof, yet in the ſight of them who behold it, we devoutly expreſs our honour aud homage to the perſon to whom they belong. And, what things it is meet ſhould receive ſuch a reſpect, we muſt prudently leave to the judgment and arbitration of the Church, and our Spiritual Superiors.

§. 53. 9. Theſe things concerning the lawfulneſs of ſuch an inferior Veneration as is given by Catholicks to Images being cleared, whether the preſent practice herein be alſo ancient, and the uſe of later ages preciſely the ſame as the firſt, we need not be ſolicitous. 1. For, firſt, that which is lawful in any times to be practiced, may alſo lawfully at any time begin to be ſo. Nor is it neceſſary, that what is done now be alſo the practice of Antiquity; but ſufficient, if nothing in Antiquity can be ſhewed repugnant to it. Again, It is not neceſſary, that there be any expreſs Command or Precept in Scripture either for the veneration, uſe, or making, of Images; But it is ſufficient, if there be any example in the New or Old Teſtament, that it is in neither of them diſallowed:

allowed: enough, if an example there be of ſomething equal and parallel to it, the veneration of ſome other ſacred things: or enough, for the lawfulneſs of ſuch practice, if no prohibition found thereof in the ſacred Writ, as I hope for two of theſe, the making, and uſe, of Images or Pictures, Proteſtants will accord. The honor and worſhip of our Lord and his Saints all will allow a duty: what ways or modes alſo of honouring them more immediate and direct, or alſo more remote and relative are lawful, or alſo expedient, and when, it belongs to the Church to determine, and to preſcribe to us; and we are obliged to acquieſce in her judgment, and ſubmit to her Injunctions. Laſtly, It will not follow from the non-practice of any ſuch veneration of Images for ſome Ages, in all or ſome part of the Church, that therefore the lawfulneſs of ſuch a practice is no Apoſtolical Tradition; becauſe all things lawful are not, as to practice, in all times ſo expedient. And perhaps this might be the reaſon, as hath bin ſaid, of the rarer uſe of Pictures in the firſt four Ages of the Church, becauſe the Chriſtian world was not as yet ſo well cleanſed from Heatheniſme; and ſo, in later times, of the veneration or uſe of Images not being ſo univerſal in ſome parts of the Weſt, as latelier converted from Heatheniſme, and ſtill neighbouring upon them.

2. It is granted by Proteſtants, that the uſe of Images in Churches was introduced in the fourth Age. Of which thus *Chemnitius*, *Exam. Conc. Trid. part.* 4. *De Imaginibus.* ---*Cæpit in ipſis etiam Templis uſus eſſe Imaginum, non ſane ad cultum & adorationem, ſed partim ad hiſtoricam commonefactionem, partim ornatus gratia. Et cæptum hoc fuit potiſſimum circa An. Dom.* 380. Quoting a Paſſage of *Gregory Nyſſen Orat. in Theodorum Martyrem. Et Pictor etiam artis ſuæ flores induxit, in imaginibus exprimens res Martyris præclare geſtas, labores, cruciatus, immanes tyrannorum aſpectus* &c. *Chriſtique certamini præſidentis humanæ formæ effigiem. Hæc pictor, tanquam in libro loquente, artificioſe depingens, Martyris certamina nobis expoſuit. Solet enim etiam pictura tacens in pariete loqui, maximeque prodeſſe* &c. Thus *Gregory*: See alſo *Daille Traicte des Imag. c.* 4. But, for *Chemnitius* or him to argue, thoſe Pictures to be firſt made, or introduced into the Church §. 54.

Church about this time, becauſe at this time ſpoken of; or at ſuch time as theſe were ſeen here, yet not the like to have been elſewhere, becauſe not mentioned, as here, are, both unreaſonable. There are indeed produced by them two Teſtimonies in that Age that ſeem very prejudicial to Images. The one a Canon of *Conc. Elibert*, c. 36. *---Placuit Picturas in Eccleſia eſſe non debere, ne quod colitur aut adoratur in parietibus depingatur.* The other a Paſſage in an Epiſtle of St. *Epiphanius* to *John* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*. Who, as he was travelling in *Paleſtine*, coming to a certain Church and ſeeing a Picture as it were of our Saviour or ſome Saint painted on a Veil, and a Lamp hanging before it, took and tore it, as holding ſuch a thing unlawful, and againſt Scripture, to be hung up in a Church. Becauſe the place is much preſſed, I will ſet you down the Story in his own words relating to the Biſhop of *Jeruſalem* his action, and ſending that Church another Veil in ſtead of that he had torn. *---Cum veniſſem ad villam quæ dicitur Anablatha, vidiſſemque ibi præteriens lucernam ardentem, & interrogaſſem quis locus eſſet, didiciſſemque eſſe Eccleſiam, & intraſſem ut orarem: inveni ibi velum pendens in foribus ejuſdem Eccleſiæ unctum atque depictum, & habens imaginem quaſi Chriſti, vel Sancti cujuſdam: non enim ſatis memini, cujus imago fuerit. Cum ergo hoc vidiſſem, in Eccleſia Chriſti contra authoritatem Scripturarum hominis pendere imaginem, ſcidi illud, & magis dedi conſilium cuſtodibus ejuſdem loci, ut pauperem mortuum eo obvolverent, & efferrent. Illique contra murmurantes dixerunt: Si ſcindere voluerat, juſtum erat ut aliud daret velum, atque mutaret. Quod cum audiſſem, me daturum eſſe pollicitus ſum, & illico eſſe miſſurum. Paululum autem morarum fuit in medio, dum quæro optimum velum pro eo mittere: arbitrabar enim de Cypro mihi eſſe mittendum. Nunc autem miſi quod potui reperire, & precor ut jubeas presbyteros ejuſdem loci ſuſcipere velum a latore, quod a nobis miſſum eſt: & deinceps præcipere, in Eccleſia Chriſti ejuſmodi vela, quæ contra religionem noſtram veniunt, non appendi.* But 1*ſt* both theſe prove beyond that, for which the objecters preſs them; by oppoſing alſo the making or uſe of holy Images, at leaſt in Churches: the firſt forbids the painting or placing of them in Churches: the ſecond tears, and defaces thoſe found there. Proteſtants approve neither of theſe: Let themſelves then frame an Anſwer to them.

2*ly*, For

2*ly*, For the firſt of theſe, I grant, there might be good ground for ſuch a prohibition, conſidering the times: the Council being very ancient and held in *Spain* before that of *Nice*, at which time a great part of the Weſt were Heathen-Idolaters: and taking the *Adoratur* in their ſenſe not for any inferior Veneration, but ſuch as the Heathen gave to their Images, the Prohibition was prudently made for that very reaſon ---*Ne quod adoratur, in parietibus depingatur*; or, which comes to the ſame, *Ne quod in parietibus depingitur, adoretur*: i. e. *Ne putetur Deus Chriſtianorum eſſe illud quod in parietibus depingitur*, as the Heathen God's were; and leſt ſuch Pictures ſhould there, by any new Converts, be adored with any ſuch corrupt notions as formerly were their Idols. To this purpoſe ſpeaks Mr. *Thorndike*, concerning both theſe places objected. 'Granting (ſaith he, *Juſt Weights, c. 9. p.* 127.) that *Epiphanius* and the Council of *Elvira* did hold all 'Images in Churches dangerous for Idolatry; (of which there is 'appearance) it is manifeſt, that they were afterwards admitted 'all over. And there might be jealouſy of offence, in having 'Images in Churches, before Idolatry was quite rooted out; of 'which afterwards there might be no appearance. But no man-'ner of appearance, that Images in Hiſtory ſhould occaſion Idola-'try to thoſe Images, in them that hold them the Images of 'God's Creatures; ſuch as are thoſe Images, which repreſent hiſto-'ries of the Saints, out of the Scriptures, or other relations of 'unqueſtionable credit. Thus He. 2. Next; for the other of *Epiphanius*: (ſuppoſing, neither that Epiſtle, nor that Paſſage in it falſified) it ſeems, that he had the ſame jealouſy with the Fathers of *Elvira*, tho not ſo much cauſe, conſidering his times; and, by ſome of his words, that he held alſo the uſe of Images in Churches to be againſt Scripture; in which therefore Proteſtants, as well as Catholicks, muſt hold him ſingular, and not to be credited: and the rather, becauſe what is urged out of other Fathers of the ſame age, *Baſil, Gregory Nyſſen*, and *Nazianzen*, allowing this uſe of them, ſhews him to be heterodox herein. And the Fathers of *Nice*, *Act.* 6. *Tom.* 5. out of the ſame pretended Epiſtle of his to *Theodoſius* the Emperor that the Iconoclaſts urged for his diſallowing Images, extract ſuch a Confeſſion of his: *Multoties locutus ſum cum comminiſtris meis, ut auferrentur Imagines,* & §. 55.

& receptus non ſum ab eis, neque audire vocem meam ſaltem paululum paſſi ſunt. Which *Comminiſtri* (ſay thoſe *Nicene* Fathers alſo) were ſuch as *Baſil, Gregory Nazianzen,* and *Nyſſen, Chryſoſtome, Ambroſe, Amphilochius,* and *Cyril* of *Hieruſalem. Epiphanius* alſo, in this Epiſtle, confeſſeth that the people of the place, where he tore the Veil, murmured againſt him for it, and this probably (if we conſider ſuch allowed uſe of Images elſewhere) not only for the loſs of their Veil, but for his controlling, as thoſe times were, a blameleſs practice. Which practice, by what the aforeſaid *Nicene* Fathers *Ibid.* relate, his own diſciples and followers imitated afterward alſo in *Cyprus*, building a Church in his honor; and ---*cum multis aliis titularibus picturis imaginem ejus in ipſo templo collocantes.* This of the uſe of Images in the fourth Age.

§. 56. 3*ly*, Granted alſo by Proteſtants, that the Veneration of Images was practiced in the fifth Age. Of which thus *Daille Des Imag. l.* 3. *c.* 7. 'In the ſecond half of the fifth Age, and 'in the whole that followed, we find frequent paſſages that 'ſpeak of Images, and ſome alſo that make mention of venera-'ting and ſerving them: [but the word *ſerving* he ſhould either 'have omitted, or ſhewed it in ſome teſtimony of that Age.] 'But then meanwhile it is granted by them, that the venera-'tion of ſacred Relicks and of the Croſs was a cuſtome of the 'fourth Age, and that God alſo then honoured theſe with many 'Miracles. Now this fourth Age was the firſt wherein the Church enjoyed a liberty of its publick Service and Ceremonies; and wherein the Church-Practices and Hiſtory were more exactly by a greater plenty of Writers, and in larger Volumes, recorded.

[See *Chamier Tom.* 2. *l.* 20. *c.* 9. §. 35. in his Anſwer to the Teſtimonies of the Fathers ---*Trecentis poſt Chriſtum annis nullum omnino veſtigium extat adoratarum Reliquiarum, vix etiam conſervatarum niſi in Sepulchris. Ergo ea veritas non eſt Chriſtiana* [a non-conſequence; for, a Truth may be in an Age, in the Writings of which it is not ſet down and regiſtred.] *Nam deinceps antea confeſſus ſum & invectum id ſtudium & auctum.* And ſee *Daille* in his Book *De Relig. cultus objecto* confining himſelf both for the non-

non-veneration of Relicks, and of the Croſs, to the three firſt Ages, and granting the practice of them in the fourth. But then, for the ſilence of the Writers of the three firſt Ages, we muſt remember him of what he hath ſaid in his *Vray uſage des Peres, l.* 1. *c.* 1. when he thought it his intereſt to ſhew the Fathers Works unſerviceable for the deciding of modern Controverſies; *viz.* '1. That the Writings of the three firſt Ages were few, the faith-'ful, for the moſt part, rather contenting themſelves to write 'their Faith in the hearts of men *&c.* than to amuſe themſelves 'in compoſing Books of it: 2. That the greateſt part of the Wri-'tings then publiſhed are periſhed. Where alſo he recites the Names of eight and twenty Authors, whoſe Works are loſt; and the Works, ſuch as are certain and not conteſted, of eight only, that are of any note, to have deſcended to us; yet when another deſcant better ſerved his turn, he elſewhere, *De Relig. cultus objecto, l.* 5. *c.* 3. amplifies the Writings of theſe times on this manner ---*Cum ex primis illis ſæculis* (ſaith he) *auctorum eccleſiaſticorum plurium quam viginti quinque ſuperſint monumenta, quorundam pauciora, aliorum plura, aliquorum etiam plurima, & quidem luculentiſſima---monſtrum eſſet ingens & inauditum, & plane incredibile, ſi veluti facta quadam inter ſe conjuratione, eam rem omnes ubique conſtanter in tam multis libris tacuiſſent, quæ in tota Chriſti ſui Eccleſia pro inſigni Chriſtiani cultus parte haberetur.* (And in his *Noveaute des Traditions Romaines, part.* 1. *c.* 3. *p.* 14. publiſhed ſome years before, he ſaith muchwhat the ſame, reciting there particularly thoſe many famous Writings of the three firſt Ages that have deſcended to our times.) His argument concluding hence, that what theſe mention not, then was not. But what is this *inſignis Chriſtiani cultus pars*, he there ſpeaks of? The veneration of the Croſs: as if this were ſome great and fundamental Article of the Catholick Faith. Well: for the Croſs I appeal to the equal Reader, whether the Heathens objecting then to the Chriſtians the Adoration of it mentioned by *Minutius Felix* and by *Tertullian, Apologet. c.* 16. calling the Chriſtians *Religioſos Crucis*, (with whom *Juſtin Martyr* ſeems to ſpeak like things concerning it, *In Apolog.* 2.) as well as the Apoſtate *Julian*'s reproaching them with it afterward, mentioned by *Cyril Alexandrinus, In Julian. l.* 6. doth not ſhew ſome Veneration given to

the Croſs alſo before the fourth Age. Indeed ſo often as this was objected theſe Authors had reaſon to deny ſuch an Adoration of it, as the other charged them with, namely an Adoration of two pieces of wood acroſs, parallel to that given by the Heathens to their Images, as imagining ſome Divinity or Virtue reſident therein. [*O miſeri homines* (ſaith *Julian*) *quum ſerventur arma quæ magnus demiſit Jupiter* &c. *ceſſatis adorare & colere, & interim Crucis lignum adoratis; imagines illius in fronte & ante domos pingentes*;] But yet ſuch Adoration ſo early objected ſeems rationally to infer ſome reverence and honor done by the Chriſtianity of thoſe times to it, as to other holy things. Neither hence may *Daille* juſtly draw the ſame conſequence of the Chriſtians Veneration of an Aſſe's Head from the Adoration alſo of this objected to them; becauſe we find not any ſuch Practice in the fourth, or the following Ages of the one, as we do of the other; nor no ſuch practice of the one, an Aſſe's Head, in any Age at all; But the Objection of it probably grounded on a fabulous Story, related by *Tacitus*.]

§. 57. If then, I ſay, this Veneration of Holy Relicks and the Croſs which is found in the fourth Age, or ancienter, be conceded any way lawful, or juſtifiable, then the ſame and no greater given in whatever following Age to Images can never be Idolatrous. But then, that Paſſage written by St. *Auſtine* at *Rome* about *An. Dom.* 388. *De Moribus Eccleſiæ c.* 34. much urged by Proteſtants —*Novi multos eſſe ſepulchrorum & picturarum adoratores*, ſpeaking of *turba imperitorum*, as he there calls them amongſt Chriſtians, as it declares both of theſe, the worſhip of Pictures then, as well as of Relicks, to have bin done in an exceſſive and ſuperſtitious way by ſome, ſo ſeems it to imply both alſo, and not one of them only, done in a laudable way by others; and that, if there was an inculpable Veneration of Holy Relicks in that Age (of which, and the due Honors done to the Sepulchres of the Martyrs, ſee much in his *Civ. Dei* 22. *l.* 8. *c.* and 8. *l.* 27. *c.*) ſo alſo, of Holy Pictures too; the *exceſs* of ſuch a Practice among the ſimple and unlearned being not

not likely, where *none* at all was among the prudent and diſcreet.

V. 10. Such appearing to be the Doctrine of the Church in her retaining the uſe of Images, I come now to what was in the Fifth place propoſed, That She is not anſwerable for the faults of thoſe that practice otherwiſe: (Eſpecially having laid a ſtrict charge on all Biſhops, *Conc. Trid. Seſſ. ult. de Venerat. Imag.* both for the remedying all indecencies in the making of ſuch Pictures, and removing any Superſtition in the uſe of them.) Nor can thoſe be excuſable who deſert her Communion, for any ſuch Practice, to which ſhe no way obligeth; or alſo, which ſhe with them condemneth: and much leſs, for ſuch expreſſions, as being uſed more freely in her Hymns and Poetry, are taken by them in ſuch a ſenſe, as they do, or may, know, her common Doctrine diſclaims. So long as our own practice is no way hindred from going along with the Church's Doctrine, we may not alledge any other mens practice to warrant a diſceſſion from her; may alledge no more that of Idolatry, perhaps, than that of Adultery, Murther, or Blaſphemy in her. 'Let Practice and 'Doctrine go together, we agree; ſaid Biſhop *Mountague*, *Appeal to Cæſar*, *p.* 257. If he ſpeak of a general Practice, this demands too much; but where *our Practice*, and the *Church's Doctrine* may go together, there we cannot juſtly diſagree; be the Practice of ſome others how it will. 2. Again; neither is the Church of *Rome* hereupon more obliged to abrogate a lawful Veneration of Images, becauſe Proteſtants are offended at it as liable to abuſe, than Proteſtants to lay aſide (which they do not) the uſe of Images, becauſe the Puritans are offended at them, upon the ſame account. V. §. 58.

3. But then, as to the Practice of any particular perſon in this matter; it ſeems very difficult to charge it with Idolatry. For, 1. The internal act of the Worſhip given to Images by any is not knowable to any others --*Diſtinctio Latriæ* (ſaith §. 59.

Spalatenſis, De Rep. Eccl. 7. l. 12. c. 47. n.) & aliarum inferiorum adorationum ex ſolo hominis interno dependet; quod internum non ſubſtat Eccleſiæ judicio [I add, *neque cujuſquam alterius.*] And, not certainly known, ought to be moſt charitably interpreted (eſpecially in the practice of people inſtructed in the common Creeds, and Principles of Chriſtianity, perfectly oppoſite to Idolatry.) And therefore that Paſſage of St. *Auſtine*, in *Pſal.* 113. is very unreaſonably urged by ſome Proteſtants —*Quis autem adorat, vel orat intuens ſimulachrum, qui non ſic afficitur, ut ab eo ſe exaudiri putet, ab eo ſibi præſtari, quod deſiderat, ſperet?* Which, as it was ſpoken by him of the Heathen [*Quis Gentilium*] of whom he ſaith alſo a little before that —*Quoniam in illo figmento non invenit vitalem motum credit numen occultum.* And —*effigiem viventi corpori ſimilem ſine vivo aliquo habitatore eſſe non putat.* So can it be no way applied to the common principles of any Chriſtian: and, to find it falſe, let but the Objecter, if a Chriſtian, try the experiment of the *Quis* upon himſelf; and, looking on a Picture when he prays to our Lord, tell, whether he thinks it hears him. And, ſince Proteſtants at other times do ſo freely exalt the knowledge of the Heathen too, that they were not ſo ſtupid as to worſhip Stocks and Stones, or Pictures, the works of their own hands, but only the Gods by ſuch Repreſentations which are only the viſible Memorials of them, (which they do to make the Chriſtian run parallel with the Heathen Idolatry;) why do they not meanwhile reflect on the great uncharitableneſs, on the other ſide, toward Chriſtians, in fancying or repreſenting them ſo ſtupid and void of underſtanding in their addreſſes to Images or Pictures, *ut ab illis ſe exaudiri putent* &c. I ſay then, as to the *internal* act of Veneration or Reverence given by any Catholick to an Image, ſince it can no way be known to Proteſtants, it ought to be charitably interpreted, that it doth not deviate from the Church's Doctrine.

§. 60. As to the *external*, I grant it may diſcover it ſelf to be ſuch as may be unlawful, or idolatrous; as, by the form of their Vocal

Vocal Prayers addreſſed to ſuch Images; Sacrifice, erection of Temples, and Altars, to them; a wrong confeſſion of their Faith concerning them, in attributing to them ſomething Divine, or ſome other of thoſe miſapprehenſions mentioned in the beginning of this Diſcourſe §. 2. *&c.* Of which ſome Chriſtians were guilty long ago in St. *Gregory*'s time, as appears by the Fact of *Serenus*, and in St. *Auſtin*'s, by his --- *Novi multos* &c; and ſo, for ought we know, ſome may be ſtill. But then, for thoſe exernal acts of Veneration, that ordinarily appear among Catholicks (as kiſſing, burning lights, perfuming, or incenſing them, uncovering the head, kneeling, praying, before them) I have ſhewed before §. 49. *&c.* that there are none of theſe but may be lawfully uſed (abſtracting from a bad intention) in expreſſing the honor we give to a creature; and therefore cannot be chargeable with Idolatry; and that all theſe are uſed alſo by Proteſtants in the honor they do to ſome of the Creatures. If then an Anti-ceremonial Puritan ſeeing a true Son of the Church of *England*, that he may ſay his Prayers the more devoutly, going into a Church and uncovering his head ſo ſoon as he enters into it, or into the Chancel at leaſt; bowing toward the Altar or Communion-table there, ſometimes alſo burning Frankincenſe there, (a thing as lawful, I ſuppoſe, as it is in our own houſes,) bowing at the Holy Name of JESUS, kneeling down at his receiving of the Holy Myſteries in the Euchariſt; in his taking a ſolemn Oath, kiſſing the Goſpels; in the Interrment of an honourable Friend lighting up many Torches, not for need, but as an Honor to the Deceaſed, and an Ornament of his Funeral, *&c*: as a Puritan, I ſay, would be cenſured to offend very much againſt Charity, if he ſhould accuſe or miſ-conſtrue him herein to commit a moſt groſs Idolatry or Superſtition (for, poſſibly he may do ſo) in giving Divine Worſhip to a frame of Wood, or a Name, in Incenſing a pile of Stone, in imagining God to dwell in a Fabrick made with hands, in lighting a dead man to his Grave *&c.* If I ſay this would be a moſt uncharitable and unjuſt Accuſation in a Puritan toward a Proteſtant-Conformiſt, how will not a Proteſtant ſtand guilty of the ſame fault, when, beholding a Catholick kneeling

ing

ing and saying his Prayers before an Image, he chargeth him with praying and giving Divine Honors to it, with conceiving some Divinity resident in it, or Virtue issuing from it, or, that it is lighted with his lamp, smells his sweet odours, and hears his requests. This of the difficult discovery of an Idolatrous Practice in any: In which, as it happens in several other matters, I fear, for the most part, the guilt of the Accuser is greater, than of the Accused.

§. 61. For a Conclusion to this Discourse: Having said what I think is abundantly sufficient, to clear the Church's Practice in her use and veneration of Images from so heavy an imputation, as indeed, if the Adversaries interest would permit them to aggravate it so far, doth utterly un-church it, and make it a Synagogue of Satan, and parallel to the Heathen Religions: Now I desire those *Protestants*, who charge the Church herewith, to reflect what an heavy guilt it leaves upon themselves, if such Accusation should be false and without cause; and what consequences pernicious to themselves it draws along with it. For 1. if it be a great fault to charge unjustly any private person with so hainous a crime, as Idolatry; what is it to charge the whole Catholick Church, East and West, with the Practice thereof now for above a thousand years; and this, notwithstanding our Lord's precious Blood shed for this his Church, and all his Providence over it, now when all Power in heaven and earth is committed to him; and notwithstanding his express Promise of protecting it for ever against the gates of hell? What is it, thus to call their innocent Mother a Whore, for committing such spiritual Fornication; and their supreme Spiritual Father Anti-Christ? 2. And next: What consequences doth it draw after it, most mischievous to their Salvation? Since, after they have once fixed such an Apostacy upon their supreme Spiritual Governors and Guides, and after they have thus cryed *Corban*, they conceive themselves freed and absolved from any further Obedience they owe them: And, by withdrawing *Obedience*, abandon themselves to all those errors and disorders

orders, from which this ſupreme Church-authority would have reſtrained them. Nay ſome are ſo frighted herewith, as they know not how to ſtay longer under any Church-authority at all; but run away alſo from thoſe Eccleſiaſtical Governors who have diſcovered this Idolatry and Anti-Chriſt to them; and from that Church-diſcipline alſo, and thoſe Ceremonies, which theſe judge ſtill fit to retain; as thinking they diſcern in all theſe ſome lineaments and reſemblances of him. And ſo by God's juſt judgment what aſperſions theſe inferior Guides have laid upon the Supreme, theſe other, their Subjects, have returned on them. And ſeveral ſober Proteſtants of late (See Dr. *Hammond*) who ſeem to have better weighed theſe things, in labouring againſt theſe Puritan Sects to free their own Church-Government from ſuch an *imputation*, have alſo enlarged themſelves ſo far, as to releaſe the Roman from it: and have joined themſelves with the Catholick Writers to remove Anti-Chriſt and his Seat and Kingdom quite out of the verge of Chriſtianity.

§. 62. Meanwhile, of thoſe Proteſtants, who have ſuppoſed the Roman Church Anti-chriſtian, and its Head the Anti-chriſt, and its Religion Idolatry, theſe later more zealous Sects ſeem to act much more ſincerely, and conſequentially, than the other, more moderate, party. For, ſuch Idolatry and Anti-chriſt once clearly diſcovered, God forbid good Chriſtians ſhould ſo far either admit of his Laws, or comply with his religious Ceremonies, or maintain Communion with his Members, or derive their Authority from him, as the Prelatical Proteſtancy doth with, and from, the Church of *Rome*. Would any of them correſpond ſo far with *Mahomet*'s Religion (whom yet they account not bad enough to inherit the title of Anti-chriſt, or charge of Idolatry) as they do with the Pope's? Let them then either remit ſuch Accuſation, or proſecute more ſeverely and more ſpeedily fly from, ſuch a guilt. We can never run far enough from this Grand Enemy of our Lord. For (as the Apoſtle, 2. *Cor.* 6. 14.) 'What 'fellowſhip or communion hath light with darkneſs? what 'con-

'concord Chriſt with *Belial*? what commerce *Jeruſalem* with '*Babylon*?

Let therefore thoſe Zelots who are ſo forward to heap ſuch an extremity of Impiety on the whole Church of God for ſo many Centuries before *Luther*, or alſo on the whole preſent Church beſides *Luther*'s Followers, conſider well that neceſſary conſequence thereof, which ſome others of their own ſide, to deter them from ſuch a charge, have obſerved. For —'If (as Mr. *Thorndike*, *Epilog.* 3. *l.* *p.* 357.) theſe Practices 'which the Church of *Rome* allows [and which we have 'handled here] were neceſſarily Idolatries, then were the 'Church of *Rome* neceſſarily no Church [I add, nor any other for many Ages before *Luther*, or the preſent beſides *Luther*; for, in theſe Practices all elſe agree:] The being of 'the Church, and of Chriſtianity, preſuppoſing the worſhip 'of one true God, excluſive to any thing elſe. And elſewhere, *Juſt Weights*, 2. *c.* *p.* 11. 'They that own the Church of '*Rome* for a true Church [and if it be not, where was the 'Catholick Church before *Luther*?] muſt contradict them-'ſelves, if they maintain ſuch a ſuppoſition, as that the Pope 'is Anti-chriſt, or the Papiſts Idolaters. [Their charge is too high to be poſſibly true; and to render her not innocent and free from their complaints they muſt neceſſarily make her leſs wicked.] Again the ſame Author *Ibid.* *c.* 19. *p.* 128. 'He that ſees (ſaith he) the whole Church [for the Eaſt, as well as Weſt, practice theſe by them ſtiled Idolatries] on 'the one ſide, and only *Calvin* [and his Followers] on the 'other hath he not cauſe to fear, that they who make them 'Idolaters without cauſe will themſelves appear Schiſma-'ticks in the ſight of God for it? And therefore (much more 'modeſtly) he ſaith, *Epilog.* 3. *l.* *p.* 364. 'That the honor 'of Images which the Church's Decree maintaineth is no 'Idolatry. And *Ibid.* *p.* 416. 'That the Idolatries which 'he grants to be poſſible (tho not neceſſary) indeed to be 'found in it, are by the ignorance and carnal affections of 'particulars, not by commands of the Church or the Laws of it. And, of the great danger of cenſuring ſuch general Practices of the Church, thus Biſhop *Forbes*, ſpeaking of one of

of the ſuppoſed Idolatries, *Invocation of Saints*, *De Invoc. Sanct.* 3. c. p. 322. —*Totius Eccleſiæ univerſalem conſenſum ſpernere aut damnare res longe periculoſiſſima eſt.* And much more, in abuſes only of ſome, that which he ſaith is true, *p.* 326. —*Non continuo propter periculum abuſus, aut etiam abuſum, quem reipſa cernimus, legitimus rei uſus, cum ſcandalo totius Eccleſiæ, tollendus*, aut damnandus eſt.

Surely as the Devil gained heretofore infinite of Souls in the Old World by the Practice of Idolatry, ſo, in the New, after the World's being more enlightened by the coming of our Lord, and after his old groſs Arts grown into general contempt and diſgrace, he changeth his Colours, and plays another game; and makes no ſmall Harveſt of Souls by driving and frighting them out of the Catholick Church and Faith, and former Obedience to legal Church-Authority under the pretence now of flying from *Idolatry*. And again: So great an Envy he hath to the Honor he ſees given in the Church to the ſacred Humanity of our Lord in the Holy Myſteries, and to his Martyrs, and Saints, and all that which any way appertains to them, that he now chooſeth rather to repreſent himſelf a great Zelot of preſerving Worſhip and *Adoration* entire to the one only *God*; and of not communicating any of his Excellencies to the Creature: He pleads much our Lord's ſole worthy Interceſſions and Mediation, and the neceſſity of performing all our Devotions out of the aſſurance of *Faith* and a Divine *Command:* He inſiſts much on a ſpiritual and refined internal ſervice of God, without any ſuperſtitious regard had to times, perſons, places, and ſuch as is diveſted of external and formal Rites and Ceremonies. Laſtly; both by ſome of the new Reformers within the Church, and by *Mahomet* without it, he mainly cries out againſt Superſtition, Ceremonies, a multitude of Sacraments, and their virtue, Special Ordinations and Characters of Prieſthood, Will-worſhip, Idolatry, which laſt alſo is aggravated to the uttermoſt and extended to far greater ſubtilties, than heretofore it was ſuppoſed to comprehend: And §. 63.

by this new device he hath wrought so effectually on *many*, that the memory of *God's* former *Saints* and *Martyrs* is almost quite obliterated and worn out among them; and the Offering the Evangelical *Sacrifice* grown much into desuetude; *Holy Churches* saving on the Lord's day shut up; *Holy Festivals* no more observed; Sacred Persons are seeking to credit themselves with laical, and undistinct, Habits; sacred things grown into contempt; and not enjoying so much as a negative reverenee, I mean, freedome from contumely: the Divine Worship at last so refined and purified, till it is become invisible; and, by taking away the necessary circumstances, the very substance and life thereof is perished; and by disjoining the corporal and mental, the interior and exterior, Worship, neither the one, nor the other is, by some at all, by others so devoutly, or frequently, performed. And all this, forsooth, this new Angel of Light promoteth in opposition to former *Idolatry* and *Superstition*. Was not the Great False-Prophet *Mahomet*, and the whole frame of his Religion, at least one of the chiefest Conceptions of Satan's old age, and Master-piece of all his Works? And, who so great an Enemy to Sacred Images as he? or who with greater zeal throws down, and declares war against, all Idolatry? And, by him Satan, instead of his former Pageantry and Puppets, after that God's *Messiah* was sent with a most *Spiritual Law*, and the *Divine Grace* to *perswade* men to it, hath also now set up a *sensual*, *non-ceremonious*, *facile*, Anti-law; and a *sword* to *compel* men to it.

§. 64. Now, to be safe from all these changeable stratagems and wiles of the old Serpent, sometimes assaulting us on the left hand, sometimes on the right; in former times by setting up Idolatry; in later by exclaiming against, and making shew of pulling it down: I know no such security to a Christian, as always to repose himself on the judgment of the Church. Which Church is neither terrified with the fear of *Idolatry*, so, as to deny a due Honor to the Instruments of God's glory; nor so prodigal or ignorant of the Divine Excellencies and Pre-

Prerogatives, as to give any part of them to any other: In her honouring God's Saints, or, for their ſakes, any thing that appertains to them, ſhe knows that all ſuch Honor finally terminates in God, the ſole Fountain and Donor of all that is in his Creature Honourable: And his Saints now without all vanity or ſelf-pleaſing accept ſuch Honor, in conformity to God's will; and becauſe it is for his Honor, that it ſhould be given them; And He is alſo honoured by them for beſtowing ſuch honor on them: And God's Kingdome, without all Jealouſy, remains in an Eternal Peace. *Amen.*

FINIS.

UMI